

development of a country where infant mortality is over 50 percent and the people don't know the significance of feces disposal, water impurities, or sound diet. It has proved the feasibility and efficacy of intensive language and cultural preparation of our foreign cadres, of having them live within the communities they serve rather than in isolated American ghettos, of having them receive compensation comparable to their host counterparts and play roles not as superior advisers but as coequals.

The future expansion of our foreign assistance endeavors should be along lines demonstrated successfully by the Peace Corps—and no more appropriate person could be found than Jack Hood Vaughn to preside over this extension.

Indeed, by standards of experience, knowledge, ability, personality, character, and temperament, no equal could be conjured.

Jack Vaughn is a close personal friend and became so when he was my boss at the Peace Corps. He was Regional Director for Latin America and I, Director of Programs for the west coast of South America under him, virtually from the start of the Peace Corps.

I, therefore, am able to speak of him from a vantage point of an associate as well as a friend, and as a person intimately familiar with the Peace Corps operation he is to head, for I was the second staff member brought on board by Mr. Shriver to formulate the concept of a Peace Corps early in

1961. I can also speak of him from a personal familiarity with his knowledge of Latin America and the respect Latins hold for him.

What an unusual combination of experience. Jack Vaughn has served in virtually all of our overseas agencies—the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and before that as Ambassador to Panama; our foreign aid agency as mission director in Senegal; he started his Government career in the early days of USIA in Bolivia and Costa Rica; and, of course, he served as a Regional Director of the Peace Corps itself.

The geographic diversity of his foreign experience has been broad, bringing him in direct contact with two of the three continents of the world with which the Peace Corps deals—Africa and Latin America—and with incomparable breadth and depth where the greatest Peace Corps concentration of activity lies, in Latin America.

Jack Vaughn's rise to responsibility has been meteoric and hard won. He came up the hard way, by his bootstraps. It's a real American success story worthy of Horatio Alger—how a golden gloves fighter from Columbus, Mont., going under the inauspicious pseudonym of "Johnny Hood" made good. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1943 and volunteered for the Marine Corps where his talents earned him promotion from private to captain in just 3 years. He got a master's degree from

Michigan when he got out and taught there and at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1949 he offered his services to USIA and from there had the spectacular span of Government service and rise of personal success previously recounted.

In the Peace Corps, Jack Vaughn built the Latin American program from insignificance to the dominant program. He was a man who was universally respected in a highly competitive organization and whose advice and counsel were sought by all. As a boss, he encouraged his associates to innovate and inspired from them an indescribable devotion which led to uncanny productivity. This human quality no doubt played an important part in his continuing series of successes and his warm following among his associates and the foreign peoples with whom he worked. He was immensely popular and respected both as Ambassador to Panama and previously as ICA mission chief in Senegal as well as at his other posts. The universal acclaim he received from all Latin capitals during his recent trip as Assistant Secretary of State is well known and recognized as a major contribution to our Latin American relations.

It gives me great pleasure to give this nomination my unqualified praise and to urge upon you and the committee the confirmation of a most unusually well qualified man for this job of great national and international importance.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under its previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday noon next.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 16 seconds a.m.), the Senate adjourned under the order of Thursday, February 10, 1966, until Wednesday, February 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Ralph B. Winders, director, department of student work, Mississippi

Baptist Convention, Jackson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Mark 6: 34: *And Jesus, when He came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and He began to teach them many things.*

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy great mercy and compassion as revealed by Jesus.

This day we recognize ourselves as individuals needing guidance and wisdom even as the shepherdless sheep in His day.

Look upon us with love and mercy and grant unto us that we may know Thy will for us, and having known it, give us the courage to act accordingly.

Make Thy presence known in a special way to this assembled body as they deliberate this day.

Forgive us our sins and lead us in ways of righteousness.

We pray in the name of Christ and for His sake and in His presence. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amend-

ments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; and

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

THE WASHINGTON POST HAS NOT PRINTED THE TRUTH

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is an open season on Congressmen at all times, and that newspapers feel privileged to take potshots at us at any time they so desire. But I do think there are certain ethics

and certain rules of sportsmanship that should be observed.

I am referring to an article that appeared in the—I will call it the Washington Post; I have another name for it—when they included under my picture a statement that I was one who had contacted the FCC on behalf of Midwest Video. I have written a letter to the managing editor or publisher of the Washington Post. I know, and I have been advised, that it will not be printed.

Though I cannot get the letter printed in the newspaper, I am going to get it before the public. I might say that I wrote this letter yesterday, and I was angry and incensed when I wrote it:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1966.
MANAGING EDITOR AND/OR PUBLISHER,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to an article which appeared in the Post today, may I state categorically that the individual who was responsible for the caption which appeared below my picture on page 10, is a reprehensible, contemptuous, malicious liar, when he wrote that I had "contacted FCC on behalf of Midwest Video."

Furthermore, I state that there was libelous intent, when no effort was made to ascertain from me the accuracy of that statement, especially in view of the fact that I was called on the telephone about 2 p.m., Saturday, February 12, to inquire if I could furnish the Post with a late photograph. I asked no question as to what use was to be made of the photograph, presuming that it was to be used in connection with one of several statements which I have made on the floor of the House since the reconvening of this session of Congress. The party who called requesting this photograph expressed surprise that I would be in my office on Saturday afternoon. What I am saying is that there was an opportunity to check with me at that time to determine the accuracy of the statement which was to be used in connection with the picture. It was about 3 p.m. Saturday when a messenger from your newspaper called to pick up the photograph.

By inference, innuendo, and insinuation, you have left the impression that I have been involved in some sinister, illegal, and unethical actions which I feel was intended to reflect upon my reputation. I will not sit idly by, permitting this inference to stand unchallenged.

As a former newspaperman, a graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, and one who has spent approximately half his life as an editor and publisher, I believe I am acquainted with what I consider to be one of the first obligations of a newspaper, and that is to publish the truth, and to not rely on assumptions or presumptions, as was obviously done by the writer of the article in question.

I am herewith demanding a full retraction of your statement, insofar as it refers to me; an acknowledgment that it was an error; and a public apology for suggesting or inferring that I was acting on behalf of either Midwest Video or their Mr. Morrell, whom I do not know and with whom I have had no dealings of any kind or character.

The only connection I have had in any way with Midwest Video's controversy with FCC, is the forwarding to the FCC of correspondence from constituents of mine, living in Poplar Bluff, Mo., expressing their opposition to the blacking out of one channel in St. Louis, carrying a national network program, in order to protect a satellite (repeater) station in Poplar Bluff which rebroadcasts programs from a parent station

in Illinois, the local content of which is of no interest whatsoever to the audience in Poplar Bluff, who would prefer the programs from the St. Louis station which are received via CATV with greater clarity, more satisfaction, and preferred, I believe, by all of those who are connected with the CATV in Poplar Bluff.

Regretting that your reporter did not see fit to contact me before carrying the story which gave an entirely erroneous impression, and reflected on my integrity and my recognition of my responsibility to the constituents whom I am privileged to represent, I am,

Respectfully yours,

PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

I would like to insert as a part of my remarks a letter that I wrote to the FCC on September 30, 1955, in response to a number of letters from my constituents complaining about one feature of a decision that they had, and they were asking for a rehearing. On this I asked permission to appear and to present the facts on behalf of my constituents.

I do not care a tinker's dam about Midwest Video or any other company, but I am interested in my constituents in southeast Missouri, and any time I feel that their interests are not being best served, I reserve the right to go to any agency of the Government—to the President of the United States, if necessary. And if that is treason, make the most of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was wondering yesterday what was generating all that thunder and lightning around River House I. Now I know.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was up here in the office when that storm was going on, but that storm was not half as powerful as I felt at that time.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I think the gentleman's anger is just and proper. I read the story. I know the man who wrote the article. I had considered him fair-minded and objective. I am surprised to see him write such an unfair story. He did not do me the courtesy of calling me which was surprising. He had plenty of time to talk to me. He did not think about calling me because "his story" may have been cluttered up with facts rather than unfounded allegations of pressure or influence.

I make the same denial as the gentleman. My office in a routine fashion sent a letter asking for a report.

When the time comes that a Member of Congress cannot ask an agency for a report, then we do not have a democracy. I have no connection with any of these people of any nature, type, or description, and I have no interest in them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and the Members of Congress must take it upon themselves to make the

newspapers and other news media observe some accuracy and some truth, and especially when they lie, to make them retract those lies. I am incensed over this thing. I will admit that I am emotional about it, but I will not stand by and permit someone to try to besmirch my reputation. That is the most valuable thing I have in this world, a good reputation, and I intend to keep it.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1965.
HON. E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am the Congressman from the 10th District of Missouri which encompasses Poplar Bluff.

A considerable number of my constituents in Poplar Bluff are presently subscribers to the Midwest Video CATV system. I am informed that these constituents presently receive TV service from the stations in St. Louis, via microwave service, which is thoroughly satisfactory to such persons. I am also informed that, as a result of the Commission's recent decision in July 1965, in docket No. 14321 regarding the microwave licenses of Black Hills Video Corp. which brings these signals to Poplar Bluff, the service to my constituents who are subscribers may be seriously affected—at least as to the programs of one of the principal networks.

There is pending before the Commission a petition for reconsideration and rehearing and Black Hills has asked the Commission to hear argument on the impact of the license conditions which the Commission's decision has imposed. These conditions will seriously affect service to my constituents, particularly since it will require the CATV system to black out the more desirable St. Louis signal for a poorer quality signal which comes from an out-of-State station through a repeater station located in Poplar Bluff. The people of this community are interested in the affairs of the State of Missouri, and the programs which come from a station located in one of their principal cities are more important to them than those from a station in Illinois.

I think, in the circumstances, and since the decision was adopted by only a 3-to-2 vote, that the entire Commission should hear the arguments made by Black Hills as to why it would be unfair to the subscribers to impose such conditions.

As the duly elected Representative of these people, I respectfully request that the Commission grant me the privilege of appearing before it in this rehearing to place before it the facts as to the impact of its decision upon my constituents.

I would appreciate your careful consideration of this request and being advised of your determination in the matter. I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to each Commissioner directly, and would appreciate your notifying the parties of my request.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

THE CRITICS

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention

of the Members of the U.S. Congress a very well written editorial that appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger on February 12, 1966, Lincoln's Birthday. It points up the problems that President Johnson faces with many of the so-called experts who are making divisive statements. It is timely and pinpoints the arguments over Vietnam that are being brought into focus somewhat by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings and the dire need for getting the views from those persons who are eminently qualified authorities on southeast Asian affairs.

It is my opinion that unqualified persons, whether in Government or outside of Government, should be more discreet in their statements to the public concerning Vietnam unless they have all the facts before them. The security of the United States is too serious a problem, and the subject matter should not be bandied about by reckless individuals who are careless with the facts:

The article follows:

THE CRITICS

While President Johnson pushes ahead seeking the best way for peace in Vietnam—without utter surrender by the United States—it is worthwhile to look at who is rocking the boat.

The latest "experts" to blast off at the President are Senator WAYNE MORSE, who has trouble agreeing with anyone, and former Ambassador George Kennan, whose background doesn't show any skill in dealing with the problems of southeast Asia.

Mr. Kennan thinks the United States should "dig in and wait," neither withdrawing nor escalating until a political solution can be reached.

Senator MORSE is harping away at fears that President Johnson is leading the country into a war with China while keeping the American people in the dark as to what his intentions are. This was the Senator's line in a speech this week at Boston University in which he claimed that the "Government has led us so far down the road to government by secrecy you don't know what the facts are."

Mr. Kennan may be a reputed authority on Communist affairs, but his service in the Soviet Union was as an Ambassador during the Stalin era. He has also held State Department planning positions and he retired as Ambassador to Yugoslavia in 1963 after 2 years of service. Mr. Kennan is not an authority on southeast Asia and has had no diplomatic service in the Far East.

Senator MORSE is a lawyer, a former professor of law, and a nominally Democratic Senator who knows little about southeast Asia. It is not particularly surprising that he disagrees with the President on Vietnam, since he has seldom demonstrated a constructive attitude on any important issue.

The arguments over Vietnam are being brought into focus somewhat by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings. These hearings ultimately may result in a meaningful debate of objectives and methods in southeast Asia.

But so far the results have not been entirely useful.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has once again gone over the administration's policy without adding much new to the picture and without convincing the Government's critics.

With the exception of Mr. Rusk, who is obviously informed on the day-to-day details on the overall thrust of American policy, none of the other witnesses qualifies as an

expert in southeast Asian affairs or has the latest inside information from the Government available to him.

The American people should realize from whence comes the opposition to the Johnson policy. It may be helpful to the Senators to get varied opinions on the Vietnamese situation, but the Foreign Relations Committee would perform a greater service by getting the views of persons who are eminently qualified authorities on southeast Asian affairs.

JUSTICE FRANCIS L. VALENTE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York State judiciary has lost one of its most illustrious members. Justice Francis L. Valente, of the Appellate Division of the New York State Supreme Court, died Friday night.

Justice Valente was a careful lawyer. As demonstrated by his steady rise in the judiciary, he was also a careful and conscientious judge. He served as a judge of the court of general sessions from 1945 to 1955 when he was elected to the supreme court. A few months after he took office in 1956, he was named to the appellate division by Gov. Averell Harriman. In 1961 he was reappointed by Governor Rockefeller.

As an assistant district attorney for New York County, I was privileged to appear often before Judge Valente in the court of general sessions. He presided over many trials which I prosecuted. He was always considerate and always conscious of the rights of both the defendant and the people. He thoroughly understood complicated questions of fact and law. It was a pleasure to try a case before him. Through this association I knew at first hand Justice Valente's great ability as a trial judge, and he became a valued friend.

On Saturday, Justice Bernard Boten, presiding justice of the appellate division, spoke for the entire court when he said:

The State has lost a great and learned judge and the court a staunch and cherished comrade.

I want to take this occasion to express my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Valente and their two sons, Francis, Jr., and Peter.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD articles about Justice Valente which appeared on February 13, 1966, in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1966]

FRANCIS VALENTE, JUSTICE, 60, DEAD—IN APPELLATE DIVISION OF STATE SUPREME COURT SINCE 1956

Francis L. Valente, associate justice of the appellate division of the State supreme court, died Friday night at University Hospital at the age of 60. He suffered a heart attack 2 weeks ago.

Justice Valente had been the liaison between the appellate division and the criminal

courts of New York City on problems of administration and procedure.

He was extremely knowledgeable about city affairs and active in civic organizations, particularly those involving Americans of Italian descent.

In tribute to him, Bernard, the presiding justice of the appellate division, first department, said yesterday, "The State has lost a great and learned judge, and the court a staunch and cherished comrade."

Judge Valente was born in Greenwich Village. At his death, he still lived in that area, at 37 Washington Square West. He was educated in the public schools and then went to New York University, where he received a bachelor of science degree in 1926 and a law degree the next year. He was admitted to the bar in 1928 and was in private practice until 1944, specializing in corporate, probate, and criminal law.

FIRST ELECTED IN 1945

In 1945, Mr. Valente, a Democrat and a nephew of State Supreme Court Justice Louis A. Valente, was elected judge of the court of general sessions. Five years later he was elected to the supreme court. A few months after he took office in 1956, he was named to the appellate division by Gov. W. Averell Harriman and in 1961 he was reappointed by Governor Rockefeller.

One of the most widely publicized rulings was made in the general sessions court during the 1953 trial of Minot F. Jelke, the heir to an oleomargarine fortune, on charges of procuring women for prostitution. The judge barred the press and the public from the court "in the interests of good morals" and to curtail reporting of a trial "steeped in filth."

This ruling was reversed by the court of appeals in 1955, which held that Jelke had been improperly convicted because of this refusal to allow the press and the public into the court. However, Jelke was retried the same year, convicted, and sent to Sing Sing Prison.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY ALUMNI PRESIDENT

Justice Valente was president of the New York University Alumni Federation from 1956 until his death and president of the New York University Law Alumni Association from 1959 to 1961. He was a member of the Elks, the Grand Street Boys, and the Holy Name Society. In 1956, he received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Manhattan College. He served as American chairman of the advisory board of research of the Italian-United States Center of Judicial Studies in Milan.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 13, 1966]

JUSTICE FRANCIS L. VALENTE

Justice Francis L. Valente, of the State supreme court's appellate division, a central figure in a Tammany Hall fight in 1948, died at University Hospital Friday night. He was 60.

The Carmine DeSapio faction of the New York County Democratic Party chose Justice Valente as its candidate, in 1948, for Surrogate of New York County over the protests of Mayor O'Dwyer and Tammany leader Frank J. Sampson.

The original DeSapio choice had been Justice Valente's uncle, Supreme Court Justice Louis A. Valente. He was withdrawn after protests by leaders of the bar. Francis Valente, a general sessions court judge at the time, became the substitute.

The ensuing furor, which threatened to bring a primary fight between Francis Valente and Vincent Impellitteri, led to the ouster of Mr. Sampson. Peace within Tammany was restored when Francis Valente withdrew as a candidate and Hugh E. Rogers became the compromise candidate.

JELKE CASE

Five years later, in 1953, Justice Valente against became a controversial figure, as general sessions judge trying the sensational case of Minot "Mickey" F. Jelke, heir to an oleomargarine fortune, who was charged with forcing women into compulsory prostitution behind the doors of cafe society.

"In the interest of good morals," Justice Valente banned the public and the press from the courtroom while pretty call girls gave the intimate details of their work with Mr. Jelke.

As a result of the ban, the court of appeals ruled that Mr. Jelke was entitled to a new trial. Justice Valente again presided, and the young heir was again convicted and sentenced to 3 to 6 years in prison, of which he served 2.

During his 10 years as general sessions judge, 1945 to 1955, Justice Valente liked to make moral pronouncements on cases before him. In 1950, he convicted a man and a woman for illegally placing babies with foster parents and taking a fee for their service. Justice Valente called this a nauseating and revolting practice of trading in human flesh.

In 1953, when he sentenced two public loaders working on the New York piers for extortion, he denounced "the craven surrender of business to crime in the interest of 'business as usual.'"

He was born in New York City and received his law degree from Manhattan College. Admitted to the bar in 1928, he maintained a private practice until 1944, when he was named to the bench. In 1955 he was elected to the supreme court.

He was appointed to the appellate division in 1956 and reappointed in 1961.

Bernard Botwin, presiding justice of the appellate division, said yesterday, "the State has lost a great and learned judge and the court a staunch and cherished comrade."

Justice Valente was president of the New York University Alumni Federation from 1956 until his death, and president of the New York University Law Alumni Association from 1959 to 1961.

He was a member of the Elks, the Grand Street Boys Association, the Holy Name Society, the Catholic Club, and a number of law associations.

Manhattan College awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1956.

Surviving at the home, 37 Washington Square West, is his wife, Aurelia. He also leaves two sons, Francis, Jr., and Peter C. Valente.

A requiem Mass will be offered at 10 a.m. Tuesday in St. Joseph's Church, 371 Avenue of the Americas.

HEADSTART PROGRAM IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1965, as a new administration was taking office in the city of New York, the Office of Economic Opportunity made \$6.5 million available to New York City to provide Headstart programs for some 11,843 of our youngest and neediest children. We are all familiar with Operation Headstart, which puts Federal antipoverty funds to work through local groups to provide preschool education to

underprivileged youngsters. It is one of the most promising long-range programs of the war on poverty.

If the proper groundwork had been done early in January, some 49 groups approved by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity would have been making plans. The funds could have been put to work, and children could have been in preschool education by now.

On February 11, 6 weeks later, not a single approved group had been officially notified by the city that funds were available or authorized to proceed.

Now, even after the groups are notified, it will take some time to get started.

From my investigation, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is no excuse for this long delay in implementing the Headstart programs. There is no way to make up the time lost forever. There is no way to repay these children with education that they did not get. There is no way to go back.

Yesterday I sent both the mayor of New York and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity telegrams urging immediate action to break this bottleneck and make these funds available to the children of New York City.

The telegram is as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1966.

MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY,
New York, N.Y.

HON. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent action to insure immediate use of \$6.5 million made available on December 27, 1965, by Federal Government for New York City Headstart programs. Some 11,843 needy children have lost forever more than a month of essential preschool education. There is no excuse.

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DESIGNATE MEMBER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 22

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 22, 1966, George Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF MRS. MINK TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 22, 1966.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago I spoke in this Chamber on the problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam and what I felt could and should be done about it. Among other things I suggested that we establish a blacklist of these ships which would prohibit them from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes. Such a blacklist has existed for 3 years with respect to those trading with Cuba. I am gratified to be able to acknowledge that late last week I was informed by the State Department, in a response to my letter of February 4 urging the President to take such action, that such a blacklist has been approved. The details of this Presidential order are found in the Federal Register of Saturday, February 12, 1966, on page 2706.

In my opinion, such action is overdue since our official policy too long has maintained a double standard of exempting those who trade with Ho Chi Minh from the penalties imposed on those who trade with Castro. In no way should the Hanoi regime be led to think we consider trade with them in any sense less detrimental to our national interest than trade with Cuba.

This action is a step in the right direction and I shall continue to press for the enactment of legislation prohibiting free world ships that aid Hanoi from doing any business whatsoever in U.S. ports—public or private—and to insure that no U.S. aid goes to any country that allow its ships to help supply North Vietnam's war economy. We have tolerated this aid and comfort to Ho Chi Minh far too long.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM: WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions, I have called upon this administration to bring an end to the shipment on their ships by our allies of goods for our enemies in North Vietnam. I made speeches from this rostrum of the House calling for an end to free world shipping to North Vietnam by any means necessary. Specifically, I did so on January 12, January 19, January 26, and February 2.

In the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a week ago, it was said that the British could effect an embargo on Rhodesia with our over-eager help in 48 hours. Yet we have been unable to get their support in cutting off the supply of the Vietcongs by sea. After many months of effort, Britain is still the

No. 1 violator among the free world nations.

On December 21, I telegraphed the President urging action on this and, to this date, I have received nothing more than an acknowledgment from the White House.

Now, finally, the administration has stuck out its chest and announced that, as of January 25—25 days after my telegram—it was blacklisting any vessel shipping goods into, or out of, the North Vietnam port of Haiphong.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this action.

However, it seems to raise this question. We have been fighting in Vietnam since mid-1962. We have suffered 2,005 dead and 9,658 wounded through February 7, 1966, and spent almost uncountable billions.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we just starting to blacklist these ships? Either it should have been done 3 years ago or this is a blind to avoid effective action, diplomatic or naval.

It simply boils down to this. If blacklisting is not effective, why bother with it at all. If it is effective, why did we not do it in 1962 or 1963 instead of waiting until 1 week ago.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the American fighting men in Vietnam have a right to know the answer to this question. So do the American people.

One further question: Is this all we are going to do about free world shipping to North Vietnam?

THE QUESTIONS THAT PATRIOTS SHOULD ASK

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are at war in Vietnam. It is a war none of us wanted and a war we want to end honorably as quickly as possible.

Every good citizen would like to support his President. Every citizen wants the President, the executive branch, the Defense Department, the generals, to be right.

In order to find the correct solutions as quickly as possible, we need open debate and deliberation.

Secret decisions, managed news, "pat" answers, summary dismissal of inquiries, refusals to respond to proper questions do not supply the right answers, or fortify the confidence of the U.S. fighting man, or the public.

Every patriot can support his country and yet ask pertinent questions at the same time.

One of the most knowledgeable patriots in my district—with practical military experience and firsthand experience in Chinese and southeast Asian affairs—Col. Allen Griffin, asks a number of questions, editorially, in the Monterey, Calif., Peninsula Herald newspaper.

Each Member of Congress, as well as the President and his advisers, ought to ponder these questions.

The full text of the editorial by Colonel Griffin follows:

THE QUESTIONS THAT PATRIOTS SHOULD ASK

The pursuit of the war in Vietnam has been a demonstration of a series of wrong "estimates of the situation."

This is a term that is used by military people, usually preliminary to a decision to move, to remain in place, go backwards, or what have you. It is a term particularly of military intelligence. Nearly everything that is involved in the strength and weaknesses of the enemy is comprehended within the "estimate of the situation."

And, of course, the enemy also is making his estimate of the elements of strength and weakness in your situation, local, regional, global.

President Charles de Gaulle gave the late President John F. Kennedy his estimate of the situation in Vietnam and suggested that the United States begin a process of seeking peace immediately.

The late President was not convinced by General de Gaulle's estimate and decided, contrarily, to become more involved. That was the tragic beginning of escalation—the beginning of an infantry war of Americans against Asians on Asian land among Asian people, the last thing the U.S. Army ever wanted to be engaged in again after Korea.

Up to this time this wasn't a war in which U.S. ground forces were engaged, but one in which U.S. materiel backed by a handful of advisers was sent to the assistance of a friendly government. Now by degrees it became our war. Escalation by manpower became a fact.

When President Lyndon Johnson took the oath of office he inherited a war as well as a vast, scattered domestic program.

Determined to do everything better and faster than his predecessor, he was psychologically prepared to provide the force necessary to push this war to an early conclusion. After all, it was a war against the spread of communism, which was and is further justification.

Surely his advisers gave him an estimate of the situation. That called for escalation. It didn't work very well. Then came a further estimate and a further escalation. That also fell short. And so on until nearly 200,000 American troops became hostages to this war, and North Vietnam came under continuous bombing attack except in the immediate vicinity of the capital city, Hanoi, and the most important seaport, Haiphong.

Then again, surely operating under an estimate of the situation, the time was deemed ripe for a peace offensive. That estimate could not have been on anything other than the possibility of bringing the war to a peace table. Wrong again. It didn't work.

Now we have returned to bombing. Where do we go from here? How much of a land war of Americans against Asians are we going to throw our Army into? And where do we go from there? These are legitimate questions for congressional debate. And they are legitimate questions for the debate of patriotic citizens.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:
This is the first annual report required of the National Capital Transportation

Agency by section 6 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—Public Law 89-173.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-five was marked by significant advances toward solving the transportation problems of the Washington area.

Congress approved plans for a rapid transit system, authorized its construction, and authorized grants from the Federal and District Governments as a first stage in financing its development. As soon as funds were made available, the Transportation Agency began the necessary work still remaining before actual construction can begin.

There is, nonetheless, much left to do. The rapid transit system will achieve maximum usefulness only when it is extended into Maryland and Virginia suburbs. The interstate compact among Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia will be promptly presented to Congress for its consent, in order that the interstate authority may develop plans for a full regional system and a financial plan for its construction. Arrangements must be perfected to transfer the responsibility for the system in an orderly and proper way from the Agency to the interstate authority. These tasks are not easy, and it will require diligent effort on the part of many people and agencies to master the problems that remain.

The Congress can be assured, however, that all of these problems are being given the fullest and most diligent consideration, and that none of them will be allowed to stand in the way of an uninterrupted schedule of construction.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1966.

PRESERVATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The period of expansion and exploration, the great era of successive western frontiers, has now become a part of our American past. To the pioneer of history the wilderness was a foe to be conquered, so that he might make farms and pastures out of the endless forests.

Today's pioneer has a new purpose—to preserve some remnants of that wilderness from the onrush of modern civilization.

The ax and the plow will not serve us in this struggle. Today's instruments are more subtle. They are progressive law and informed public opinion—demanding that we maintain our wilderness birthright.

The Wilderness Act is one in the long list of creative conservation measures that Congress has passed and I have signed into law.

Legislation is one thing; administration is another. The executive branch must fulfill its responsibility with commonsense and imagination. Our people must be given the opportunity to know, even for short periods of time, the wonders of God's creation expressed in earth's wilderness areas.

The maintenance of our existing wilderness system is a priority program of the Federal Government. We are constantly reviewing primitive and roadless areas to determine whether they should be recommended for preservation as part of our wilderness system.

The Congress has wisely provided for public participation as reviews of the primitive and roadless areas proceed. I am determined to assure that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior will provide full opportunity for the expression of public views before final recommendations are prepared for transmittal to the Congress.

I am pleased to send to Congress today the second annual report of our progress in implementing the Wilderness Act. We are well underway toward protecting God's gift of mystery and wonder that is the American wilderness.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1966.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1966.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, due to a speaking engagement at the 45th annual stockholders meeting of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., at South St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, February 9, 1966, it was necessary for me to be absent on rollcall No. 16. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 16 on H.R. 706, the bill to amend the Railway Labor Act.

ISOLATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FROM DOMINANCE BY BIG BUSINESS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, isolation of the Small Business Administration from dominance by big business has long been preached and praised by the Congress. From the agency's beginning in 1953, its independent status has been jealously guarded and constantly supported. Among the most vociferous champions of such organizational independence when Members of the Senate were President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY. Without doubt the status selected for it by the Congress has proven the most effective in order for it to best serve the small business community.

Such independent status, however, cannot alone guarantee the success of an agency or of its programs, nor can it countervail the absence of leadership, direction, and inspiration.

Of late we have seen the business loan program, the key program of SBA, through poor planning and poorer management, virtually disappear. We have seen another important SBA responsibility, procurement assistance, dwindle to ineffectiveness.

And now, we hear rumors that what remains of the Johnson administration's operation of the Small Business Administration is to be buried by its transfer to the Department of Commerce. Apparently, this once fine and potentially great agency is to be swept under the gigantic rug of a major department.

The proposed transfer of the Small Business Administration represents White House recognition of its failure; this alone explains the present condition of SBA and its programs. Loss of its independent status will only make permanent the injury. Without independent status, the agency cannot and will not provide the services small businesses across the country so desperately need. The spokesman for small business in big government will be dead.

Mr. Speaker, bipartisan support of independent status for the Small Business Administration will prevent the piracy of a facility dedicated solely to the betterment of the small business community.

To preclude this demotion, if not the disappearance of SBA, the Nation's 4.7 million small businesses call upon us to reiterate our long held insistence upon independent status for the agency. I urge unanimous approval of the following concurrent resolution, which today has been introduced by all the Republicans serving on the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives:

H. CON. RES. 538

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense

of the Congress that the Small Business Administration should continue to be an independent agency within the executive branch of the Federal Government, under the general direction and supervision of the President but not within or affiliated with any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as a delegate to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Chamber on Wednesday when rollcall No. 16 was taken. U.S. delegates to the Conference were at the airport welcoming the Mexican delegation Wednesday at the time of the rollcall. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye." I respectfully ask that the RECORD so indicate.

TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 12, we commemorated the birthday of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, whose anniversary is observed by the Polish people throughout the free world. Unfortunately, the Polish people are captives of communism, and public celebration of this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Poland and all the other captives of communism.

The birthday of Tadeusz Kosciuszko is also of historical significance to the United States, since this great Polish hero made an outstanding contribution to the American Revolution. He served courageously in a number of Revolutionary War battles and worked on the planning and construction of fortifications for the Delaware River, Fort Mifflin, and West Point. Kosciuszko was given the rank of brigadier general in the American Revolutionary Army for his contribution to our struggle for independence.

Kosciuszko then returned to his homeland and served in Poland as a leader in the unsuccessful insurrection against the Russian invaders.

It is fine for us to commemorate these days, Mr. Speaker, but our commemoration should be a practical one. Therefore, I strongly recommend the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

In addition, I believe it is necessary that the Voice of America provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the brave people of Poland. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Polish language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives daily straight news and is fearful under present administration policy of offending the Soviet Union. However, the brave people of Poland deserve the truth.

The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

A BUSINESSMAN AND MONEYLENDER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, high interest rates have always been a beneficial tool for the big banks, providing them with prosperity while the rest of the country suffers from the ill effects of tight money and higher prices.

Many people from all levels of the economic ladder are seriously affected by high interest rates. The small businessman finds it impossible to obtain loans at his bank, the small homeowner faces more expensive home mortgages, even the prosperous businessman encounters difficulty. I am in recent receipt of a letter from such a businessman, who wishes to remain anonymous, expressing his thoughts and complaints over the resulting high interest rate policy being pursued by the Federal Reserve Board. The businessman in his letter describes the wartime financing of the Roosevelt administration and the business world's co-operation. Perhaps the Federal Reserve Board and big business in our Vietnam crisis now may learn something from this old policy of holding down rates. We know that the cost of our Government debt has risen almost a billion dollars this year, thanks to Federal Reserve monetary policy, and our cities and local governments are finding it most difficult to sell bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following letter to the Members:

The PRESIDENT,
Johnson City, Tex.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a citizen, I would like to agree with your recent actions in the aluminum, copper, and steel prices, and your position on interest rates. My interest is particularly in the area of interest rates. High interest rates increase the cost of living for the masses and work to the advantage of the financial institutions. Very few people recognize the extent to which a small interest rate increase works to the advantage

of the commercial bank. For example, the bank will borrow \$1 million from the Federal Reserve at a stepup of one-half percent and loan \$10 million of its own funds at the increased rate, collecting the one-half percent increase on a total of \$11 million.

In the last years of the Roosevelt administration, short Government bonds sold to yield approximately three-fourths percent and long bonds sold to yield some 2½ percent. About that time, I had occasion to be transacting some business with the treasurer of one of our major life insurance companies and he remarked to me that his company was paying 3 percent on its reserves and had been trying to get 3 percent on its Government portfolio, but had been unable to do so. Still, they were buying 2½ percent's. They felt that this is what the Government wanted so that's what they were going to do. Apparently, the Government's wishes had been communicated.

Near this same time, a wave of liquidating government bonds occurred in the community. Again, one of the larger New York banks told me that they had a call in the midst of this wave asking them not to sell—so they didn't sell. The price immediately stabilized. Unfortunately, capital and labor both tend to be a little greedy from time to time. At this time, public officials have to be depended upon to protect the public good. It now appears to be one of those times. I would like to encourage you in your actions. Stabilize prices, and particularly, the price of money. As far as the average consumer is concerned, it is just another commodity that has to be paid for.

Who am I? I am a moneylender. During 1964, my small business ranked in the top 100 underwriters of municipal bonds in the Nation. In addition, I am one of the largest real estate developers in this part of the country, have two contracting firms, an industrial supply house and an interest in several banks and insurance companies. My biggest financial interest lies in banks and insurance—two fields that directly benefit from high interest rates.

Yet, recent history has shown that high interest rates throttle our economy and work a hardship on those least able to pay. Sometimes I feel that my dear friends, the bankers, feel we should have a good depression sometimes. Please protect us from them.

Yours for a stronger and greater America.

ILLINOIS BUSINESS REVIEW ATTACKS FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ACTION AS BANK PROFITEERING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board's decision to raise interest rates on December 6 continues to receive outspoken condemnation throughout the country.

Among the latest to join the mounting opposition to the Federal Reserve's action is the Illinois Business Review, a monthly publication of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Illinois located at Urbana, Ill.

This excellent analysis written by V. Lewis Bassie, director of the bureau, cuts

through all the Federal Reserve Board's high-sounding phrases and places the blame squarely on the desires of the bankers for more profits.

I quote this significant paragraph from the article:

As an issue of profiteering . . . the objections had just as much force as they do with respect to an increase in the price of aluminum or any other commodity. The prize of the lenders' victory is the extra increment of income which will be received from all the people who must borrow to do the things they want to do. The latter issue, by all reports, was never raised, either in the Fed's own deliberations or in the controversy with the administration. There seems to be a kind of gentlemen's agreement not to mention the mundane matters of dollar gains to the banking industry or of its consistent lobbying efforts to attain this result.

I congratulate Mr. Bassie on his incisive analysis. The Illinois Business Review joins a rising chorus of voices from all areas of the American economy which are demanding action to prevent recurrences of the Federal Reserve Board's December 6 action.

How long can the Congress ignore these demands?

I place in the RECORD the text of the article from the January issue of the Illinois Business Review entitled "Makers of Monetary Policy":

MAKERS OF MONETARY POLICY

Controversy over interest rate policy erupted briefly in December and dropped back beneath the surface of undisputed prosperity. It was, in the words of some who feel satisfied "making a mountain out of a molehill."

Announcement by the Federal Reserve Board (the Fed) that the discount rate had been raised to the highest level since 1930 was the signal lenders had been waiting for. The banks put up the prime rate by the same amount and other rates schedules were raised appropriately. This increase in interest rates across the board has been the main, immediate effect.

The Fed acted in the name of "the fight against inflation"—though it was potential rather than actual price increases that were feared. The opposition was provided by the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) and the Treasury, which manages and pays the interest on the Federal debt. They undertook to fight the battle on the high ground chosen by the financial community. Here there was plenty of room for differences in judgment about the nature of the current situation and its policy needs. The Fed's action could certainly be considered inappropriate: If war were to escalate sufficiently to give shape to the phantom of inflation, the day of a price rollback would have to be faced; but if huge war spending were avoided, there would be no real threat of inflation and no need to slow the pace of activity. As a move toward restraint, however, the action taken was little more than an idle gesture. Small changes in the rate of interest are hardly a decisive influence, and under present circumstances, the prospect that the economy might be depressed is uncertain and remote. In the confusion of generalities and abstractions on this high economic level, President Johnson could hardly have agreed to carry the fight to Congress and the people.

As an issue of economic stabilization, the objector's cause was lost. As an issue of profiteering, however, the objections had just as much force as they do with respect to an increase in the price of aluminum or any other commodity. The price of the lenders' victory is the extra increment of income

which will be received from all the people who must borrow to do the things they want to do.

LARGER INCOMES FOR LENDERS

The latter issue, by all reports, was never raised, either in the Fed's own deliberations or in the controversy with the administration. There seems to be a kind of gentlemen's agreement not to mention the mundane matters of dollar gains to the banking industry or of its consistent lobbying efforts to attain this result. The fallacy in this approach has been pointed out by Galbraith: "Those who lend money are permitted to urge higher interest rates not for the greater return but as a selfless step designed to protect the Nation from the evils of soft money, loose financial practice, and deficient economic morality. An economist who sees the need for a higher weekly wage may well be suspected of yielding to the unions; one who urges an increase in the rediscount rate is, however, invariably a statesman. This should not keep anyone from penetrating to the fact. There is a lively, insistent and durable preference by the moneylending community for high rates of return; this is related to an intelligent view of pecuniary self-interest."

The Fed's action was responsive to industry pressures consistently applied since the recession of 1960-61 ended. The word "inflation" has been bandied about in such a way as to exploit all our fears of economic collapse, of international payments problems, and of war stringencies. At the same time, the interest equalization tax and other restrictions on foreign lending have been strongly opposed. Although total commercial banks loans and investments have been rising about twice as fast as gross national product in recent years, the banks were not satisfied to gain from volume increases alone but wanted the kind of price increase that high demand always encourages. This has now been granted, in an action intended not to halt the credit expansion but merely to moderate its pace. With other interest rates higher, the banks lose nothing by discounting at a higher rate. The accompanying order to permit them to pay higher rates on time deposits was designated to insure that they could compete for available liquid balances.

It is true that not all of the gains are retained by the banks. The interest they receive is partly passed on to the holders of time deposits, and other costs have also risen. Nevertheless, the primary effect is to benefit savers and lenders in general at the expense of borrowers and spenders. The more widely the benefits are shared, the more the high level structure of rates is solidified.

MASTER OR SERVANT?

If there was any real need to restrain the expansion of credit, action that would have been directly effective could have been taken. A moderate tightening through open-market operations during the past year had already shifted the free reserve position of member banks from a moderate plus to a moderate minus. More was possible, and a still sharper restriction could have been accomplished by raising reserve requirements. That, however, would really have cut into the bankers' lending and earning capacity. It would have brought the Fed into conflict with the banks as well as with the administration. Chairman Martin felt that there were "compelling financial reasons" for taking the moderate, banker-approved action without delay.

As an isolated incident, one should not exaggerate the importance of this decision. It conforms, however, to the whole pattern of behavior that has persisted since the Treasury-Federal Reserve Accord of 1951. Successive policy steps led to ever-rising assets and operating revenues for the banking system. The discount rate moved ir-

regularly upward—from 1½ to 4½ percent—with temporary setbacks being confined to recession periods. In each of the three recessions experienced since then, reserve requirements were lowered. The first set of changes had effective dates from July 1953, to August 1965, the second were in the first half of 1958, and the third in the fall of 1960. Altogether, required reserves were reduced from 24 to 16½ percent for central reserve city banks, from 19 to 16½ percent for reserve city banks, and from 14 to 12 percent for country banks. The reasons cited for these changes varied with the circumstances of the economy and the banking system. One consistent effect was to enable the banks to pay off indebtedness and improve their assets and earnings position in recession as well as in prosperity years.

The latest change in reserve requirements was the reduction on time deposits from 5 to 4 percent in the fall of 1962. This increased moderately the differential from the 12 to 16½ percent requirements on demand deposits. Together with the progressive increases in the maximum rates of interest payable on time and savings deposits (which were raised, for example, from 1 percent to 5½ percent on 30- to 90-day certificates), it facilitated and encouraged the dramatic upward sweep by which the volume of commercial-bank time deposits doubled from the beginning of 1961 to the end of 1965.

The rules of the game that result in uninterrupted banking expansion are as follows: Favorable decisions on the volume of credit in slack periods encourage the use of credit to expand demand, so that with recovery there is a tendency for prices to be bid up. Then the rise in prices is taken as a sound basis for raising interest rates. With volume and price of credit both rising, banking prosperity is assured. The results may be seen in almost any city across the country; often the newest, tallest, and most luxurious office buildings, complete with original art works, are owned by banks and other financial institutions.

The Fed has cooperated so consistently in this game that one may well ask, "Who is controlling whom?"

No matter how one may be inclined to answer this question, it is hard to avoid the thought that the perverse cyclical elasticity of the money supply, which was the subject of so much discussion in the 1930's, has never been corrected. In a downswing, it may again operate against us, just as it has operated for us in this long postwar upswing. Events seem to warrant the conclusion that a public governing body cannot transform a private banking system which creates money on the basis of fractional reserves into a reliable instrument of public policy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ASKED TO VETO THE BANK ACT MERGER AMENDMENTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Thursday I asked President Johnson to veto the Bank Act merger amendments passed by the House February 8, and cleared for Presidential action by the Senate February 11.

This bill will hurt the public, will hurt the banking industry, and will hurt the Federal Government.

The so-called guidelines for evaluating proposed mergers will guide the banks right back into the courts for another protracted round of expensive litigation. In the end, after the Supreme Court tells us the meaning of what Congress intended in drafting the vague and ambiguous language contained in this bill, we are liable to find ourselves at the same place we were before this bill was enacted. Further, the intent of some of the proponents to remove the banking industry from under the antitrust laws is unworthy of Congress.

Second, the forgiveness provisions of the bill is a bald act of favoritism. We ought to forgive all the banks that have violated the antitrust laws or none of them. I fail to see why Congress should select three banks for special treatment and not the others.

Finally, we have demoted the Attorney General to the rank of lieutenant. The bill permits any Federal banking agency approving a merger to intervene, as a matter of right, in a suit instituted by the Attorney General. We are thus stepping back into the 19th century when the legal business of the Federal Government was handled among different public officers, departments, and branches. We will have under this bill the unique situation of Federal Government attorneys appearing on both sides of a suit involving a bank merger.

I am convinced that many of the Members who supported this hastily and desperately drafted bill did so reluctantly, and that they will secretly rejoice should the President refuse to sign it. I urge my colleagues to reread this bill, S. 1693, and see what we have done. The public and the banks deserve better treatment.

BOY SCOUT MANUEL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have as my guest in my office last week, an outstanding young man from my district who would be a credit to any district. His name is Manuel Rodriguez III and he is representing the Cuban Boy Scouts in my district at the ceremonies here in Washington which mark the 50th anniversary of the signing of the congressional charter of the Boy Scouts of America.

Manuel is a refugee from the Communist totalitarianism which grips his native land. He came to Miami 4 years ago from Havana with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Rodriguez, Jr., of 341 West 36th Street, Hialeah, Fla. His father now works for a Miami firm of certified public accountants and Manuel has an ambition to become a lawyer.

At 13, Manuel has distinguished himself in the Boy Scouts. Since he joined this great youth organization in November 1963, he has earned 22 merit badges,

become a patrol leader in Troop 3061, been active as a den chief, and earned the Eagle Scout Award. He was chosen for outstanding school, church, community, and scouting records. Manuel attends the North Hialeah Methodist Church and Henry H. Filer Junior High School.

It is with great pride that I welcome Manuel to Washington. He has made a fine contribution to the Third District of Florida as a distinguished representative of the Cuban Boy Scouts. We applaud him as a fine example for our youth to follow.

ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE LEGISLATURE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a statement on the subject of legislature reapportionment which has been approved by the National League of Women Voters and the Miami Metropolitan Dade County League of Women Voters who called it to my attention. It is recorded as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON APPOINTMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES AS ANNOUNCED BY THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 12, 1966

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing the league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of "unpopular" court decisions, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its longstanding interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of the people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD]

may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my wholehearted support to H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, which is commonly known as the cold war GI bill of rights. I offer this support as a grateful veteran who gained a college education and a law degree through the original GI bill of rights for veterans of World War II.

I speak as one who knows from experience what it means for a young man to be uprooted in his late teens or early twenties to serve in the Armed Forces. This vital period of a man's life can be the deciding factor in determining what he will accomplish in the years ahead. The education and training that a young man ordinarily receives in these years provide him with the skills and knowledge that he will use to earn his living, raise his family and contribute what he can to his country and to the world.

When a national emergency requires a young man to spend these years in military service, both common sense and common decency demand that we do all we can to replace that which we take away from him. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we have a solemn duty and obligation to these young men whom we have placed in the forefront of our worldwide battle to contain communism. I contend that we owe them the opportunity for education or vocational training, for financial help in buying a home—the things they might have been able to do for themselves had they been permitted to remain in civilian life.

We have done these things for some 8 million veterans of World War II and for some 2,400,000 who served during the Korean war. Our boys who are fighting today in Vietnam, and those who are serving and have served throughout the world during the past 10 years are no less entitled to these considerations.

I think we should emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we are not paying these boys for what they have done; we are repaying them for what we have taken away. It is important that we understand the difference. In light of this difference, it becomes apparent why the benefits of this act should apply to every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine, no matter whether he fights the Vietcong, stands guard in Berlin, or mans a missile silo in Nebraska. When they have served their time, and are ready to again take their places in civilian life, we must be ready to help them make a smooth and satisfactory transition.

The following summary explains the major provisions of H.R. 12410, and how it would provide this needed assistance to our returning veterans:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 12410

EDUCATION

Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in

the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time.....	\$100	\$125	\$150
Three-quarter time.....	75	95	115
Half time.....	50	65	75
Cooperative.....	80	100	120

Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act, whichever is later. Training is provided for active-duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. Administrative provisions of the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this proposed program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools. First-year cost: \$327 million.

GUARANTEED AND DIRECT HOME LOANS

Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs are extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of \$7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of \$17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan closing.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED MEDICAL CARE

At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible under the provisions of this bill for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is based on availability of a bed and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is required of veterans of earlier conflicts.

PREFERENCE IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. This benefit is not extended to those on active duty for training.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE-CONNECTION OF CHRONIC AND TROPICAL DISEASES

This presumption of service-connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, as listed in section 301, title 38, United States Code, now applicable to war veterans, is extended to those veterans with service after January 31, 1955.

BURIAL FLAGS

The bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after

January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans. First-year cost: \$47,000.

JOB COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE

Places veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling. First-year cost: \$2 million.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by increasing protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service from \$80 monthly rental to \$150 monthly rental.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IS TO BE COMPLIMENTED ON A MAGNIFICENT JOB THAT WAS RENDERED TO THE TRAGIC VICTIMS OF HURRICANE BETSY IN LOUISIANA AND OTHER STATES—THE WORST HURRICANE THAT HAS HIT THIS COUNTRY IN HISTORY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, so often in Congress, Members find themselves frustrated at times when they cannot, on behalf of their constituents, always get many a difficult problem solved. On occasions, this frustration causes many of us to criticize unsatisfactory results, as it is difficult, many times, to tell our constituents that we were unable to work their problem out. However, I do think that certainly simple justice would be served if when an agency does do an outstanding job that their work be brought to the attention of this membership, and certainly give them a commendation that they deserve and so justifiably earned. So, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have sent to the Honorable Ross Davis, Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration which is self-explanatory and which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Hon. ROSS D. DAVIS,
Executive Administrator,
Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. DAVIS: I am writing to convey to you the deep gratitude of the people of Louisiana for the outstanding assistance which the Small Business Administration has rendered to those who suffered damages and losses last fall during the tragic Hurricane Betsy.

Never before has a single Federal agency helped so many in Louisiana, so quickly, efficiently and willingly. I was naturally made well aware of the fine job which your agency was performing from many reports I received, both from businesses and individuals, but it was not until I read your latest statistics that I realized in full the tremendous scope and extent of this help—27,000 applications received requesting \$125 million and as of

this writing, 23,000 approved for funds totaling nearly \$100,000,000. In the 5 months following Hurricane Betsy there were more loans disbursed than in all the previous 13 years of the Small Business Administration's history—this record of the Small Business Administration certainly tells the story of this great accomplishment.

It must be a tremendous source of satisfaction to you to know how well and ably your fine agency has performed and to see the great amount of good that has come about in Louisiana as a result of your efforts. Your Small Business Administration employees and representatives and all those directly and indirectly connected with your agency worked long and hard, and went beyond the ordinary duty required of Federal employees over these many months to bring about this magnificent assistance. It was something the people of Louisiana and we in Congress as their Representatives will always be grateful for. No agency in the 23 years that I have been in Congress has ever done a finer job. It was truly one of the finest hours in the history of our Government agencies.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

BOBBY C. PAPPAS OF LOUISIANA NAMED NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF GREEK SECTION, ALL AMERICANS COUNCIL, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to extend brief words of congratulations to Bobby Constantine Pappas, of Monroe, La., who was recently named national chairman of the Greek section of the All Americans Council of the Democratic National Committee.

In recognizing Mr. Pappas, I speak both as the only Member of Congress of Greek descent and as the honorary chairman of the Greek section of the All Americans Council.

Bobby Pappas' accomplishments as an American citizen of Greek origin make him an excellent symbol of the contribution to the American heritage of citizens whose antecedents are in other lands and a symbol as well of the justice of the action of Congress last year reforming our outmoded and discriminatory immigration laws.

President Johnson directed himself succinctly to this point when, in a letter directed to you last August, Mr. Speaker, he said:

Our present restrictions say that Italians, Greeks, Spaniards and those from all the southern European countries in particular are not as desirable as others. What a shameful declaration.

I was privileged to be among those present when, 2 months later, in ceremonies at the Statue of Liberty, President Johnson signed into law a bill that struck down that shameful declaration.

Born in Arkansas, Bobby Pappas spent 2 years in the land of his heritage, study-

ing under private tutorship in Athens and Missolonghi. Since 1939 he has made his home in Monroe, La., where he is president of the Rendezvous Restaurant Corp. His business has brought him success, and he is a board member and past president of the Louisiana Restaurant Association.

But Mr. Pappas has not confined his energies solely to private business.

COMMUNITY LEADER

In community service, he served as an area campaign chairman for United Cerebral Palsy in 1955 and for the following 7 years acted as national director of United Cerebral Palsy as well as Louisiana chairman of that organization. He also has served on several committees for the State government and in that connection received in 1958 the Axson-Chopin Distinguished Service Award from the Louisiana Public Health Department.

In service to his political party, Mr. Pappas has acted as campaign manager in his area for several outstanding Democrats. In 1960 he was the Fifth District campaign manager for Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson; in 1964 he did a similar job, with added responsibilities as district finance chairman for the ticket of President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY.

Mr. Pappas is a board member and past president of the Greek Orthodox Church of Monroe. He is as well a past district governor of the American Hellenic Educational and Progressive Association for the States of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas.

I want to mention that in his new capacity as national chairman of the Greek section of the All Americans Council, Mr. Pappas succeeds another distinguished American of Hellenic origin, Gregory Lagakos, a Philadelphia attorney who was recently named judge of the county court of Philadelphia. I wish to note also that the executive committee of the Greek section recently unanimously approved the appointment of another outstanding citizen, Commissioner Charles Mesenazos, of Elizabeth, N.J., as its national executive director.

It will be the task of Bobby Pappas to continue the work of his organization in broadening the channels of communication between the Democratic National Committee and Americans of Greek heritage. But in a larger sense, it will be his task, through his active participation in our Nation's public life, to follow the invitation extended to him by Vice President HUMPHREY, to "work together in strengthening the goal which Greece itself first gave to mankind—liberty, freedom."

U.S. SAVINGS BOND GUARANTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce a bill authorizing the Treasury Department to initiate a new series of savings bonds guaranteeing the investor a redemption equal to the purchasing power of his original investment.

I realize this is a new concept in dealing with the public debt. I would urge the committee to whose attention my bill is directed to give it close scrutiny. But I believe the concept is valid as a protection of the small investor who puts his faith in the United States, who is unfamiliar with more sophisticated investment techniques and who, in the past, has been penalized by inflation. We have all heard the claim that savings bonds will return \$4 for every \$3 invested. But we know through sad experience that the \$4 return has often bought less in goods and services than the original \$3 investment.

I would tie the return on this new series of bonds to the Labor Department's cost-of-living index. I would restrict the total value of bonds that could be held by any individual, so that the small investor remained the principal beneficiary. I would apply the index provision only to bonds held to maturity, which would reduce speculation on price changes. I would keep interest at a reasonable rate, but probably somewhat less than that available for other bonds.

This plan, I believe, would contribute to fiscal stability in encouraging savings in times of rising prices, when we normally are plagued by excessive spending. I also believe it would diversify holdings of the public debt, which is healthy. Finally, it would add an important constituency to those opposing inflation. I think it is realistic to say that we are not likely to face a threat of intensive price deflation. Prices have a way of remaining at a level, even during economic recession. It is inflation that will continue to threaten the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the committee will study the draft of this bill and work out its details with the Secretary of the Treasury. I do not presume to fix every detail myself. But the principle, I am convinced, is sound and should be implemented.

SETTLED POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker:

U.S. policy in the Vietnam war appears to be definitely settled for the time being—

The Times-Picayune of New Orleans declares.

It is one of building up military and economic strength in South Vietnam and, though it may take years, to exterminate or banish the Vietcong—

The newspaper states. And it adds:

President Johnson has now indicated the definitive shape of the policy by saying that he had the overwhelming backing of the country and of Congress for the course the administration is pursuing.

The editorial declared:

Why we are in Vietnam, it seems to us, is becoming better understood. The short reason: To stop aggression. But it is not merely to stop the attempted take-over of the Vietnamese. It is even more to raise a barrier to the almost limitless plans of the Peiping Reds to spread their wars of liberation as fast as they can find opportunities * * *. A long war in Vietnam carries with it some hazards. But the hazards of failing to meet the challenge now are probably much more grave.

Here is a thought-provoking article on an issue of national concern and I am making it available for the RECORD, where others can study it in depth:

[From New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Feb. 14, 1966]

U.S. VIET POLICY SEEMS SETTLED

U.S. policy in the Vietnam war appears to be definitely settled for the time being. It is one of building up military and economic strength in South Vietnam and, though it may take years, to exterminate or banish the Vietcong.

President Johnson has now indicated the definitive shape of the policy by saying that he had the overwhelming backing of the country and of Congress for the course the administration is pursuing. He avers that there is little or no difference between that policy and what main witnesses have said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "No one wants to escalate the war * * * no one wants to surrender and pull out," he said.

As we read it at the moment the outlook is this: A long grueling war with gradually rising pressure on the Communists but also restrictions on escalation that might result in a bigger war; intensified efforts to eliminate the guerrillas combined with economic improvement projects to lift the spirit of the Vietnamese in the villages and strengthen their will to thrust out the Vietcong infiltrators.

The economic-morale problem won't be solved in a month or a year but it has to be a part of a winning war (and after war) strategy. Experts believe that the job can be done if it is pursued with the determination that should mark all aspects of the war effort.

This country will pursue its drive for negotiations to end the hostilities. Nothing promising has yet developed. Until it does, there is no alternative to getting on with the war business.

The "quit Vietnam" element in the United States has been having its say. From here out it probably will be looked on with increasing disapproval wherever it is shown to interfere with the deadly serious war effort.

Why we are in Vietnam, it seems to us, is becoming better understood. The short reason: To stop aggression. But it is not merely to stop the attempted takeover of the Vietnamese. It is even more to raise a barrier to the almost limitless plans of the Peiping Reds to spread their wars of liberation as fast as they can find opportunities. There is nothing secret about these Chinese sponsored national liberation fronts as standing policy with the Mao regime and its satellites. Any success with it in Vietnam would probably open up a bag of troubles in areas outreaching southeast Asia.

A long war in Vietnam carries with it some hazards. But the hazards of failing to meet the challenge now are probably much more grave.

THE FEDERAL IMBALANCE OF PAYMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY—THE RATIO OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES IN THE CLEVELAND AREA FROM 1963 TO 1965

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have endeavored to determine the extent of Federal dollars spent compared with Federal tax dollars collected in the Cleveland area.

It was my purpose to show how vital the role of the Federal Government has become in assisting other levels of government, as well as the individual citizen. In addition, it has been my purpose to make available information indicating fluctuations in Federal, State, and local expenditures which affect these programs, and how these changes directly relate to the lives of people in my congressional district, the city, and the State.

By calculating Federal expenditures and commitments in the Cleveland area, I have been able to inform my constituents and residents of the Cleveland metropolitan area exactly how much of their Federal tax dollars are returned to serve them each year in the form of Federal grants, contracts for goods and services, mortgage guarantees, research agreements, education programs, and other assistance benefits, as well as the judicial and regulatory functions, operated for their benefit.

This information is provided at the conclusion of this report which is the 11th in the series of separate reports I have sent out since August 1965. I will list each of the reports which was written, the date of release, and a very brief summary of its contents, so that the ratio of Federal expenditures to Federal tax revenues from the Cleveland area will have more meaning for my constituents.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN THE CLEVELAND AREA

On August 20 of last year, I made public an education study, the first of my studies on Federal programs and expenditures in the city of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. At that time, I was pleased to announce an increase in Federal assistance to all levels of education from \$24.8 million to \$58 million, or 133 percent, between fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965. Federal assistance to the Cleveland Public School System jumped from \$2.1 million to \$5.7 million with marked increases in the Agriculture Department's food assistance program and new and innovative Office of Economic Opportunity programs in the area of education. Federal assistance and grants to institutions of higher educa-

tion went from \$18.3 million to \$33.8 million, while Federal assistance for retraining and vocational assistance went from \$4.7 million to \$18.5 million.

A week later, a study of foreign aid was completed which showed that 83 greater Cleveland area firms received AID production and technical assistance contracts for \$4,911,650 in fiscal year 1965.

At the beginning of September, I released a study on Federal assistance to cities and noted that the Bureau of Public Roads spent almost \$83 million in the Cleveland area in fiscal year 1965. HHFA, since the inception of its various programs, has committed a staggering \$1.248 billion to the Cleveland area. Of this amount, \$983 million was in FHA's mortgage guarantee program, \$12.5 million in public housing, \$13 million in subsidized senior housing, \$14.7 million in college dorm construction, and offers of \$59 million for urban renewal assistance, of which only \$14 million has been used thus far.

On September 10, I listed the independent regulatory agencies with offices in Cleveland working for the public's benefit. These small but very important Government offices spend a little over \$4 million a year in Cleveland.

Toward the end of September, I found that the Federal Government in fiscal year 1965 spent \$312 million in Cleveland on health and welfare activities, a figure up \$10 million from fiscal year 1964. Included in this was \$150 million in social security benefits to the county—a figure which will rise to \$214 million in fiscal year 1966—and \$147 million for the assistance of veterans.

On October 15, a study on Federal law enforcement expenditures was announced, showing that about \$4.3 million was spent in Cleveland on this area.

A defense and space programs study was released on October 30, and, not counting veterans assistance, showed, despite a decline, \$230 million spent on these activities in the Cleveland area. In fiscal year 1965, defense procurement was \$102.7 million, Atomic Energy Commission activities, \$26.2 million, and space activities, \$84.2 million.

On November 13, I released a study on Federal aids to business. These programs rose from \$60 million worth in fiscal year 1964 to \$80 million in fiscal year 1965. Of this amount, \$7 million went directly and almost exclusively to businessmen through such programs as small business loans.

On January 21 of this year, I finished a major study on natural resources and antipollution programs. I found that, although major steps are being taken in these areas, and the Federal Government spent \$6 million in the Cleveland area on water and natural resources, northern Ohio's proportion of these types of expenditures is very low and totally inadequate.

On February 14, I released the 10th report on tax collection, Post Office Department, and General Services Adminis-

tration activities in the Cleveland area. The expenditures for these groups went from \$67.1 million in fiscal year 1964 to \$88 million in fiscal year 1965, with post office expenditures of \$53 million and

GSA expenditures of \$24.7 million in fiscal year 1965.

The results of these studies and some final summary conclusions are listed here in the RECORD:

Total expenditures of all Federal agencies in the Cleveland area

	Fiscal year 1964	1965
Judicial branch: Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.....	¹ \$850,000	\$860,000
Legislative branch:		
General Accounting Office.....	¹ 670,500	678,800
Government Printing Office.....	381,853	526,138
Executive branch:		
Department of Commerce.....	51,810,055	78,818,781
Department of Defense ²	129,729,000	124,815,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	134,017,454	141,988,057
(Social security benefits to rest of county).....	+70,000,000	+70,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	56,319,432	59,931,414
Department of Agriculture.....	6,707,174	7,712,319
Department of the Interior.....	¹ 800,000	825,045
Department of Labor.....	6,113,396	8,213,238
Department of Justice.....	¹ 116,000	1,176,000
Post Office Department ²	49,336,350	53,857,355
Department of State ²	¹ 4,500,000	4,911,650
Department of the Treasury.....	12,423,000	12,649,000
Atomic Energy Commission.....	29,186,000	2,247,000
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	(3)	(3)
Export-Import Bank of Washington loans.....	3,650,000	3,650,000
Federal Aviation Agency.....	2,538,638	2,449,000
Federal Communications Commission.....	450	3,450
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	189,680	198,363
Federal Power Commission.....	(3)	(3)
Federal Reserve System.....	(4)	(4)
Federal Trade Commission.....	117,000	117,000
General Services Administration.....	8,704,000	24,690,000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	101,675	101,675
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	81,910,000	84,195,000
National Labor Relations Board.....	454,000	504,000
National Mediation Board.....	15,000	15,000
National Science Foundation.....	1,490,605	8,907,477
Office of Economic Opportunity.....		14,451,665
Railroad Retirement Board.....	¹ 15,000,000	15,173,326
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	800,000	900,000
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	¹ 120,000	124,165
Selective Service System.....	¹ 190,000	190,266
Small Business Administration.....	¹ 1,000,000	¹ 1,700,000
U.S. Civil Service Commission.....	¹ 142,000	142,005
Veterans' Administration.....	¹ 144,867,000	¹ 146,639,952
Grand total: ³		
City.....	745,250,000	827,346,000
County.....	815,250,000	897,342,000

¹ Estimated.

² These 3 Departments' figures are for the Greater Cleveland metropolitan area. Although all the other figures are for the city of Cleveland, they may (with the exception of HEW) be used for county figures as well, since Federal activity in the county is generally centered through a city office. The activities of the three Departments in the Greater Cleveland metropolitan area cannot be separated from the economy of the city of Cleveland.

³ No regular expenditures Cleveland area.

⁴ The Cleveland bank actually returns large sums to the Federal Treasury.

⁵ The grand total has been rounded to thousands and it (and the figures composing it) include no double accounting.

FEDERAL TAX REVENUES FROM THE CLEVELAND AREA

One of the major purposes of initiating these staff studies of Federal expenditures in the Cleveland area is to compare the ratio of Federal revenues generated from our area with Federal funds being committed and spent for various programs in the same geographical area.

This ratio has only been estimated in the past because of the immense difficulties in determining the sum total of all Federal dollars for the growing number of programs in which the Federal Government acts alone or in concert with other levels of government.

In addition to these difficulties, the only statistics currently available for internal revenue collection are based upon a district comprised of 47 counties in the northern half of Ohio. Therefore, it became necessary to develop a clear definition of how Federal revenues could be delineated for the city of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, as well as the base

figures for the internal revenue tax district of 47 counties. For purposes of comparison, such statistics are also provided for the State of Ohio and the country as a whole. The formula to determine tax revenues for geographical areas smaller than the tax district can be found in the footnote appended to the table of statistics which follows.

Between fiscal years 1963 and 1965 the total amount of Federal taxes collected in the city of Cleveland rose from \$641 million to \$718 million or an increase of 12.1 percent. During the same period revenues to the Federal Government from the county rose from \$1,227 million to \$1,409 million or an increase of 14.8 percent; while the Federal tax revenues for the 47-county tax district rose from \$3,985 million to \$4,520 million or an increase of 13.4 percent. During this period, Federal revenues from the whole State of Ohio rose 10.5 percent. It is interesting to note that the Federal revenues in each of these areas was well

above the 8-percent increase in Federal revenues nationwide.

As a direct result of the impressive effects of the 1964 tax cuts, business activity increased, as did revenues and profits. These gains are reflected in increased tax revenues to the Federal Government which rose from \$267 million in fiscal year 1963 for the county to \$349 million in fiscal year 1965. For a similar period Federal tax revenues for the city rose from \$165 million to \$216 million.

RATIO BETWEEN FEDERAL TAXES AND SPENDING

The total amount of Federal funds expended in the Cleveland area for fiscal year 1964 was \$815,250,000 and the total amount of all Federal revenues generated from the same area was \$1,369,302,000. Therefore, for every \$1 the Cleveland area pays to the Federal Government in taxes, it received nearly 60 cents in return. During fiscal year 1965 \$897,343,000 was expended or committed by the Federal Government in the Cleveland area and \$1,409,094,000 was taken

out in Federal tax revenues indicating an increase of 4.6 per dollar or a 63.66 return to Cleveland for every Federal tax dollar taken out.

The gathering of this information has provided me with a valuable measurement of Federal activity and programs in my community. In this way, I have been able to compare Federal programs with their legislative intent. More importantly, these records provide a means by which the taxpayer can determine whether he is getting his money's worth.

TABLE A.—Internal Revenue Service collections in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County and tax district ¹

(In thousands of dollars)

Type of tax	Fiscal year 1963			Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965		
	Tax district	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland	Tax district	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland	Tax district	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland
(1) Total collection.....	3,985,600	1,227,235	640,826	4,408,392	1,369,302	704,880	4,520,066	1,409,094	718,925
(2) Corporation income tax.....	826,050	266,814	165,425	963,413	311,182	192,933	1,079,032	348,527	216,087
(3) Individual and employment taxes, total.....	2,588,074	789,023	387,420	2,819,108	871,375	416,516	2,800,304	868,268	404,611
(4) Income tax not withheld.....	424,899	120,671	59,259	459,982	130,635	62,444	516,317	146,634	68,331
(5) Income tax withheld.....	1,580,027	475,651	233,545	1,721,450	521,158	249,113	1,627,833	495,590	230,945
(6) Social security.....	520,596	172,100	84,501	566,473	196,863	94,100	597,458	207,690	96,783
(7) Railroad retirement.....	27,959	7,940	3,899	40,740	11,570	5,530	38,192	10,846	5,054
(8) Unemployment insurance.....	34,593	12,661	6,216	30,463	11,149	5,329	20,514	7,508	3,498
(9) Estate tax.....	47,534	13,499	6,628	62,318	17,698	8,459	57,098	16,215	7,556
(10) Gift tax.....	5,289	1,502	737	14,083	4,000	1,912	10,293	2,923	1,362
(11) Excise taxes, total.....	518,654	156,397	80,616	549,469	165,047	85,060	573,339	173,161	89,309
(12) Alcohol taxes.....	31,049	9,687	5,124	33,414	10,425	5,515	39,517	12,329	6,522
(13) Tobacco taxes.....	2,440	761	403	2,318	723	382	2,478	773	409
(14) Stamp taxes.....	1,250	390	206	1,616	504	267	1,522	475	281
(15) Manufacturers gasoline tax.....	74,602	18,949	8,527	78,444	19,925	8,966	83,426	21,190	9,536
(16) Manufacturers motor vehicle tax.....	52,100	15,161	7,399	56,580	16,465	8,035	54,411	15,834	7,727
(17) Manufacturers other.....	291,954	91,090	48,187	312,883	97,619	51,640	328,430	102,470	54,207
(18) Retailers excise.....	9,604	2,996	1,585	10,097	3,150	1,666	10,885	3,396	1,796
(19) Miscellaneous excise tax.....	55,651	17,363	9,185	52,040	16,236	8,589	53,507	16,694	8,831

	Collections in Ohio			United States		
	1963	1964	1965	1963	1964	1965
Total.....	6,179,114	6,693,373	6,823,098	105,900,000	112,260,257	114,400,000
Corporation income tax.....	1,350,906	1,521,198	1,696,028	15,205,000	24,300,863	26,100,000
Individual and employment taxes.....	3,998,385	4,315,889	4,240,605	66,472,000	71,592,859	70,143,000

¹ For a description of how these figures were obtained, see below.

TABLE B.—Basic statistical data

POPULATION

	1960 ¹	1963	Percent of change ¹
The State of Ohio.....	9,706,397	10,247,000	5.6
The Northern (Cleveland) Ohio Tax District ²	5,803,340	6,128,327	5.6
Cuyahoga County.....	1,647,895	1,740,177	5.6
Cleveland.....	876,050	³ 810,858	-7.4

MANUFACTURERS ⁴

	Total establishments (plants)	With 20+ employees	Value added, 1958	Value added, 1963
Cuyahoga.....	3,625	1,295	\$2,409,156,000	\$3,093,667,000
Ohio.....	15,177	5,614	\$11,472,503,000	\$15,443,018,000
Cuyahoga:				
Percent of State.....	23.8	23.0	21	20.0
Percent of tax district.....	37.0	36.2	(5)	32.3

SOCIAL SECURITY COLLECTIONS ⁴

Calendar years	State of Ohio	County of Cuyahoga
1961.....	641,700,000	147,300,000
1962.....	723,900,000	157,600,000
1963.....	832,900,000	186,600,000
1964.....	878,300,000	(5)

Shelby, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, Van Wert, Wayne, Williams, Wood, and Wyandot.

³ This was obtained from the "Special Census of Cleveland, Ohio, Apr. 1, 1965," series P-28, No. 1390, Nov. 5, 1965.

⁴ The Social Security Administration has these figures for the States and selected counties.

⁵ No information.

⁶ These figures are obtained from the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census, "1963 Census of Manufacturers: Area Studies/Ohio (MC 82(R)-826). Pra

¹ The figures were obtained from "Population Estimates, series P-25, No. 324, Jan. 20, 1966," of the Bureau of Census.

² The Northern Ohio (Cleveland) Tax District is composed of 47 counties: Allen, Ashland, Ashtabula, Auglaize, Belmont, Carroll, Champaign, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Darke, Defiance, Erie, Fulton, Geauga, Hancock, Hardin, Harrison, Henry, Holmes, Huron, Jefferson, Lake, Logan, Lorain, Lucas, Mahoning, Medina, Mercer, Monroe, Ottawa, Paulding, Portage, Putnam, Richland, Sandusky, Seneca,

Shelby, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, Van Wert, Wayne, Williams, Wood, and Wyandot.

³ This was obtained from the "Special Census of Cleveland, Ohio, Apr. 1, 1965," series P-28, No. 1390, Nov. 5, 1965.

⁴ The Social Security Administration has these figures for the States and selected counties.

⁵ No information.

⁶ These figures are obtained from the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census "1963 Census of Manufacturers; Area Studies/Ohio (MC 63(P)-S36), Preliminary Report" and the Bureau's "1958 Location of Manufacturing Plants by County, Industry, and Employment Size." Adjustments have been made for the omission of Monroe County in the 1963 report by reference to the 1958 report.

NOTE.—The population figures for the intervening years can be calculated from these figures. Cuyahoga County's population is 28.4 percent of the tax district's population. Cleveland's population has gone from 49.1 percent of the county's in fiscal year 1963 to 46.6 percent in fiscal year 1965.

TABLE C.—Basic statistical data

RETAIL TRADE¹CLEVELAND METROPOLITAN AREA AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS²

	1963	
	Establishments	Sales
Ohio.....	84,346	\$12,905,181,000
Cleveland tax district.....	51,182	\$7,733,262,000
Cuyahoga County.....	13,177	\$2,414,239,000
City of Cleveland.....	8,177	\$1,278,144,000
Cuyahoga's percentage of tax district.....	25.8	31.2
Cleveland's percentage of county.....	62.0	52.9

[Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, and Medina Counties]

	State average		Cleveland average	
	June 1965	June 1964	June 1965	June 1964
Manufacturing.....	\$128.36	\$121.75	\$133.24	\$126.63
Contract construction.....	166.04	153.53	178.24	165.72
Wholesale and retail.....	88.21	85.46	100.97	95.25

BUSINESS PATTERNS³

	Employees, March 1964	Total business units
Ohio.....	2,608,482	166,890
Cleveland tax district.....	1,575,531	99,603
Cuyahoga County.....	577,735	30,409
County's percent tax district.....	36.6	30.5

AUTOMOBILES¹

	1963			
	Auto dealers		Gas stations	
	Estab- lishments	Sales	Estab- lishments	Sales
Cleveland tax district.....	2,918	\$1,511,000,000	6,297	\$594,020,000
Cuyahoga County.....	454	\$440,101,000	1,331	\$150,969,000
Cleveland.....	288	\$214,719,000	692	\$68,658,000
County percent of district.....	15.5	29.1	21	25.4
City percent of county.....	63.4	48.8	52	45.0

³ Ohio Labor Market Information, "Employment, Hours, and Earnings in Ohio June 1965."

NOTE.—About 34 of Cleveland's workers are in manufacturing and 14 in nonmanufacturing trades. Using a weighted average, Cleveland may be said to have had wages 7.2 percent higher than the State average in fiscal year 1965, 6 percent in fiscal year 1963, and 6.6 percent in fiscal year 1964.

Notes to tables A, B, and C.

The Cleveland tax district figures for fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965 are given in the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The county figures for line 2 were obtained by multiplying the tax district figures by the percent manufacturing value added by the county (32.3 percent). This percentage was not adjusted between fiscal years 1963 and 1965, because the county appears to have grown at the same rate as the State, and the State only slightly less than the Nation. There are no figures on the number of corporations in Cleveland, so the county corporation tax figure was multiplied by the city's percent of the county's retail firms (62 percent).

Lines 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 were broken down by means of the population percentages and line 5 was adjusted to reflect the higher average wage of the area.

Line 6 was obtained by adjusting the State and county social security collections from calendar years to fiscal years (allowing a growth of 5.5 percent in collections between fiscal years 1964 and 1965, similar to the change between 1963 and 1964). The tax district's contribution was obtained by noting that the tax district paid 66.2 percent of the State's withheld taxes. City collection figures were obtained by use of the population percentages.

Lines 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19 were obtained by determining that Cuyahoga County accounted for 31.2 percent of the tax district's retail sales and the city of Cleveland accounted for 52.9 percent of the county's sales. This was done because it is assumed that excise taxes are actually paid by the consumer and that it is more accurate to try and determine what the people of the area pay in excises than what the manufacturers pay. Customs collections have been included in these figures. The post office in Cuyahoga County has collected about \$44,000,000 in revenue in each of the last 3 fiscal years, but the cost of operating the post offices has usually been about \$50,000,000 per fiscal year.

Lines 15 and 16 were obtained by multiplying the county and city's percentages of the value of gasoline and automotive products sold in the tax district by that value.

¹ These figures may be obtained from the Department of Commerce's Census Bureau's "1963 Census of Business: Retail Trade in Ohio (BC 63-RA37)."

² These figures are from the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census report CBP-64-37: "County Business Patterns, 1964."

A VICTORY IN OUR FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. foreign air program has been severely criticized in the past on the grounds that the money has been wasted through graft and corruption of some foreign governments, through unnecessary expenditures upon economically useless monuments and stadiums, and because of aid money being dispersed to an excessive number of countries. In response to these valid objections, President Johnson has presented to Congress a bold, new look in foreign aid, designed to help friendly countries which are determined to help themselves.

Foreign aid Director David Bell has said:

The major lesson we have learned in the past 10 years is that unless the people we help are willing to commit themselves, are prepared to take on reforms, are prepared to make policy decisions, there is not much an outsider can do to help them.

In line with this realistic attitude, aid will now be available only for those countries willing to invest their own resources in improved farming techniques, schools, hospitals, and critical industry. They must undertake land and tax reforms, alleviate their population problems, at-

tract private foreign investment, and encourage local saving.

This new emphasis upon the efforts of recipient countries has resulted in the economic aid request being scaled down to \$2,469 billion, a reduction of \$235 million from last year's request. Instead of being widely dispersed, the economic aid will be concentrated on a select group of countries. The biggest grants will go to 20 nations and the great share of loans to just 8.

This year's aid program shows another favorable departure from the past, in that military assistance has been separated from economic assistance. This practice should be continued, as it allows for a more rational consideration of the relative merits of military and economic aid programs.

The recommended program has another innovation, which is less acceptable. It proposes to extend aid authorizations from the present 1 year to 5. There is no doubt that U.S. aid should be integrated with the development plans of recipient countries and, to do this, the United States may have to commit itself to an assistance program for longer than 1 year at a time. But a 5-year commitment is too long, as this would seriously impair congressional control and oversight of the aid program. Extending some authorizations for 2 years would be sufficient for the time being.

In selecting the recipients, the administration has given primary emphasis to our national aim of defending world peace and security. The chief threat to world peace and security today is Communist revolutionary guerrilla warfare. Poverty is a necessary prerequisite for the success of this type of warfare. It is those who have the least to lose who will be most likely to join a guerrilla force. People who have decent living standards will tend to be more conservative regarding revolutionary military action.

This thesis is supported by Columbia University Prof. Doak Barnett, in his book "Communist China and Asia."

In its efforts to build up the defenses of friendly nations in Asia, the United States must not forget that economic progress is at least as important as military strength, if not more so in the long run. It must strive therefore to achieve a sound balance between economic and military aid in its support of Asian nations. In some countries the emphasis is now heavily weighted toward military support, which creates risks not only of neglecting important problems of economic development but also of actually creating serious economic difficulties. Large scale American military aid to Asian nations cannot be regarded as a substitute for economic aid but rather as a factor which calls for even greater efforts in the strictly economic field.

In recognition of these principles, the largest single aid request is for South

Vietnam. This is a sound choice, for historical experience demonstrates that progress in economic development is essential if internal Communist seizures are to be prevented. In 1947, the Greek Government was engaged in a struggle for survival against Communist guerrilla forces. President Truman pronounced the Truman doctrine—that Americans must support free people who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure. He asked Congress to appropriate \$400 million for economic assistance to Greece and Turkey. By 1950, the Communist guerrillas in Greece had abandoned their struggle. Similarly, in the Philippines, after World War II, the Communists built a force composed of dissatisfied peasants. As it became obvious that military measures by themselves would not solve the problem, the Philippine Government carried out a broad program of social and economic progress in connection with renewed military offensives. Only in this manner was the Communist guerrilla movement in the Philippines actually destroyed.

The revised aid program not only protects our vital national interests but it does so in an economically sound fashion. We can look forward to the day when the aid program will no longer be necessary.

Economic aid to Western Europe was terminated for most of the nations by 1960. Progress in Greece and Israel permitted the United States to terminate grants in 1962. Self-support was achieved in Lebanon in 1963. Iran is in a transition to self-support. Turkey plans to eliminate reliance on foreign aid by 1973. India and Turkey now finance over three-fourths of their development programs from their own resources, and Pakistan over 60 percent. All told, about 14 nations are approaching the time when they will not need any further low-interest loan or grant assistance from the United States.

In the past 15 years, the burden of foreign assistance on the U.S. taxpayer has declined sharply. As a share of gross national product, economic aid has fallen from 2 percent to 1949 to less than two-fifths of 1 percent this year. As a share of the Federal budget, economic aid has declined from 11.5 percent to 2 percent over the same period. Most developed countries are contributing about the same percentage of their gross national product as the United States, some even more.

Foreign aid spending has little effect upon our balance-of-payments position. Eighty percent of the funds will be used to purchase goods and services in the United States. In fact, a sizable share of some American exports are now financed by foreign aid programs. In 1962, 33 percent of our locomotive and fertilizer exports and 25 percent of U.S. exports of iron and steel products were purchased under the foreign aid program.

Foreign aid also helps to boost foreign trade indirectly. AID workers abroad introduce American products and techniques in places where they may never

have been seen. Trade connections are established and a market for reorders is created.

The aid program has also facilitated private investment abroad. Since November 1961, AID has authorized 17 loans totaling \$146 million directly to private firms to establish new plants and extend existing facilities in the Near East and South Asia countries alone. Technical assistance also helps to foster private enterprise. The investment guarantee program provides a strong stimulus to U.S. firms investing abroad.

The State of Wyoming has a right to be proud of the significant role it has played in assisting less fortunate people through the foreign-aid program. The University of Wyoming has a contract with AID for a 3-year technical assistance program in Somalia. A team of Wyomingites in Somalia is working to improve present agricultural crops and survey other crops that may prove feasible. The University of Wyoming and Columbia University are assisting the faculties of engineering, agriculture, and education of Kabul University, Afghanistan, as well as assisting the Afghan Institute of Technology and the Secondary schools.

As the self-sacrificing Wyoming citizens working on these projects are aware, the path to economic development is not an easy one. Yet, the proposed aid program, with its justification embodied in the defense of our vital national interests, its basis on a sound economic foundation, and its mechanisms encouraging self-help on the part of recipients, is a remarkable bargain for the American people. There will be spectacular successes and ignominious failures in the years ahead. But, as Economist Robert Heilbroner states, we must proceed with our foreign economic aid:

Once the great march has begun, it is no longer possible to turn back. The changes in the balance of the old static society cannot be undone. There is no choice but to tread the road to its conclusion—however long and agonizing the journey may be.

WAR AND HOPE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that only good can come from the meeting of heads of state and the restatement of aims and policies in the Vietnam war.

As is well known, the Allies agreed on "a growing military effectiveness," and at the same time on an "unending quest for peace."

The candid, face-to-face exchange between the heads of state in Hawaii "should be enormously useful in the joint effort to rid Vietnam of its invaders and establish the country as a going nation," the Washington Daily News has com-

mented, and it adds that "more meetings, as suggested by the communique, could only enhance the effectiveness of the effort."

The newspaper feels that the resolution evidenced at Honolulu is good cause for encouragement.

Here is a concise and well-presented resumé of the events—and of the encouragement we can take from them—and I should like to suggest that the editorial be printed in the Record, where many may want to read it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 9, 1966]

WAR AND HOPE IN VIETNAM

Even if Ho Chi Minh has started, or eventually does begin, some type of "peace offensive" of his own, this would be no cause for an abrupt change in the plans President Johnson and Vietnamese leaders worked out at Honolulu.

Communists don't normally cave in suddenly. (It took 2 years of talks to arrange the settlement in Korea.)

The United States is engaged in Vietnam to achieve two objectives: to free the Vietnamese people of the communism invasion and to help them build a country of independence and stability, something they never before have had a chance to accomplish.

Anything which stands in the way of these goals (particularly the Communist terrorists and armies now being fought in South Vietnam) must be overcome. Anything, including a possible change of mind in Hanoi, which may help reach these goals is to be diligently encouraged.

But the success of the effort to restore freedom in Vietnam and to give the country a real chance in life depends almost altogether on the Vietnamese themselves and heavy American assistance.

The Vietnamese not only have to fight but they must take care of refugees from the battle areas, organize local government, and stabilize the economy.

The understandings reached in Honolulu between President Johnson and the Vietnamese leaders (Premier Ky and others) are designed to meet these needs.

The two allies agreed on "a growing military effectiveness" and at the same time on an "unending quest for peace."

Mr. Johnson said, for our part, we would "move steadfastly ahead" on the military front and at the same time "move vigorously" to assist the Vietnamese with their economic, social, and political problems.

All of this appeared to support Premier Ky's position that the allies must operate from strength, and evidence of willingness to use their strength, if there is to be "any kind of just and lasting settlement" with the Communists. There is no other way, as history has shown, to deal with Communists.

The payoff for the Honolulu conference does not lie in the stilted communique, but in the results over the long haul.

Nevertheless, a restatement of aims and policies for this war—this time jointly by the top leaders of the two countries, is another step in smoothing out world opinion of the justice and necessity of the U.S. presence in Vietnam.

And, as a practical matter, the candid, face-to-face exchange between the heads of state—who never before had met—should be enormously useful in the joint effort to rid Vietnam of its invaders and establish the country as a going nation. More meetings, as suggested by the communique, could only enhance the effectiveness of the effort.

No one knows how long it will take to force a decision from Hanoi—either by military force, diplomatic means, or both—but the resolution evidenced at Honolulu is good cause for encouragement.

HAVE YOU REGISTERED TO VOTE?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 of this year, I introduced H.R. 12297, which is designed to encourage voter participation by reminding citizens through a special postal cancellation mark of the need to register to vote. The cancellation mark proposed by the bill would bear the words, "Have You Registered To Vote?"

When I originally introduced this legislation during the 88th Congress, it was endorsed by the president of the Advertising Council, Mr. Theodore S. Repplier, and Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, president of the American Heritage Foundation. Most of us are aware of the continuing efforts of these organizations to encourage more Americans to vote.

Since reintroducing my bill, I have again heard from Mr. Repplier. I include his letter of February 10 as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1966.

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you very much, indeed, for your letter of January 26 enclosing a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25.

I was happy that you included my letter and am encouraged that you have reintroduced your proposed legislation authorizing a postal cancellation mark to encourage registration for voting.

We are, of course, still enthusiastic about this idea. We have by now had sufficient experience with the problem to know that constant reminders do increase the number of people who go to the polls. Certainly such a mail cancellation mark would be an effective reminder.

With kindest regards.

Cordially,

T. S. REPPLIER.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. Boggs), from February 14 through February 28, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for an indefinite period, on account of official business (interparliamentary).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RONCALIO, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday,

February 16, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TEAGUE OF TEXAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LOVE.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. NATCHER.

**ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION
SIGNED**

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION
REFERRED**

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2034. A letter from the Acting Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 32d Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2035. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriations request for three urgently needed and essential programs of Government: the National Teachers Corps,

the rent supplement program, and the Selective Service System (H. Doc. No. 380); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2036. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2037. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Bostwick Park project, Colorado, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2039. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Battle Act Report for 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2040. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of negotiated contracts for disposal of materials during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-889; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2041. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1966 report of the Office of Coal Research relating to coal research activities undertaken during calendar year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2042. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 205 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and Executive Order No. 11007, issued February 26, 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2043. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of certain publications, as follows: Glossary of Important Power and Rate Terms, Abbreviations, and Units of Measurement, 1965; Statistics for Interstate Natural Pipe Line Companies, 1964; Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1964; All-Electric Homes, Annual Bills, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2044. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 10, 1966, the following bills were reported on February 11, 1966:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1784. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10431. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10674. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12264. A bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12265. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12784. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12785. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12786. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12787. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12788. A bill to extend the period within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 12789. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 12790. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12791. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to September 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 12792. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12793. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from income pension and annuity payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's pension under chapter 15 of that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12794. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12796. A bill to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 12797. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 12798. A bill to protect domestic consumers against an inadequate supply of soybeans and soybean products, to maintain and promote foreign trade, to protect producers of soybeans against an unfair loss of income resulting from the establishment of a reserve supply, to assist in marketing soybeans for domestic consumption and exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12799. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12800. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from authorizing the development or removal of certain oil or gas deposits underlying the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12801. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 12802. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 12803. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12804. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12805. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12806. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 12807. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 588. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 589. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 590. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 591. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 592. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 593. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

396. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to support of the U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

397. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 12808. A bill for the relief of Sergio Samano Roche and Luz Maria Samano Roche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12809. A bill for the relief of Barbara Zakrzewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12810. A bill for the relief of Maydis Esmada King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 12811. A bill for the relief of Cavit Alidede; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

325. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pioneer Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Piqua, Ohio,

relative to loans to rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Future Farmers of America— Guardians of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, our country is once again preparing to celebrate the birthday of our first President. Americans, throughout the land will pause on that day, February 22, and pay due tribute to the splendid and unselfish genius of this great man who gave so much of himself and his talents in his efforts to establish and sustain this then fledgling young Nation. History records George Washington as a leader in many fields and certainly not the least of his accomplishments were in the area of agriculture. At heart, George Washington was a farmer and recognizing this, a group of America's finest young men have selected the week of his birthdate as their national week. I am speaking of the Future Farmers of America who will observe their 38th anniversary the week of February 19 to February 26.

I am sincere when I speak of the Future Farmers of America as a group of this Nation's finest young men. At home, in the Second District of Kentucky, one cannot but be aware of the very strong and the very positive influence that the members of this organization exert in their homes and in their communities. I know of no group that commands more respect or receives more wholehearted support than our future farmers and I am sure this is true not only in our section of Kentucky, but across the board expanse of our country.

Thirty-eight years ago, some high school students in Kansas City, Mo., believed in the future of farming. They formed a new organization—an organization for farm boys—and employed this belief in their creed. Their faith has been justified, for it was then as it is now—farming is the backbone and the heart of agriculture.

It was in 1928 that these boys first met and set forth their ideals and goals. The outgrowth of their meeting has been a national organization, the Future Farmers of America, with more than 454,516 active members in 9,156 local chapters. This membership is distributed throughout our 50 States and Puerto Rico. Operating under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts, it has become an educational, nonprofit, and nonpolitical farm youth movement

and has as its aim and purpose the development of agricultural leadership, of citizenship, and of patriotism.

As our great Nation has expanded its growth and power, as our population has increased, and America, in its compassion for the hungry of the world has increased its foreign commitments, so too have the Future Farmers of America augmented their program to meet these new demands upon our agricultural resources. Vocational agriculture now embraces the study of science, technology, and management. The American farm and American farmworkers remain the center link in our present agricultural system. Servicing and supplying these 7 million people are some 6 million workers. In the third and final link, an additional 10 million handle and process our abundant farm produce. Agriculture, in a sense, has become agribusiness.

To those who love the land, however, agriculture is more than a career—more than a business. It is a very rich and rewarding way of life. The dreams of our forefathers are nurtured and harvested and the good earth is replenished with hope for the farmers of tomorrow to tend. A farm is a masterpiece of nature and a symbol of the eternal bond between man and soil.

I salute the Future Farmers of America upon their 38th anniversary. A great trust is theirs and I wish for them a future of even greater achievement.

Small Business Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

This bill would replace the present revolving loan fund utilized by the Small Business Administration with three separate funds. The first of these funds would finance the business loan program authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act and the loan program established by the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act. The second fund would support the disaster loan program, and the third would finance loans under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, other than the lease guarantee functions.

As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, since October 11 of last year, the Small

Business Administration has not only failed to grant any further business loans, with a minor exception during the New York transit strike, but they have also refused to accept any applications for direct financial assistance, regardless of need. The city of Dayton, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, made application for a small business development center but was turned down. I was told by the Small Business Administration that these drastic steps are necessary because of drains on the present loan fund due to several natural disasters.

I strongly feel that this emergency requires another supplemental appropriation as well as a change in the structure of the loan program itself.

Congress created the Small Business Administration in 1953 because independent and vigorous support was needed in the executive branch of Government for the Nation's 4.6 million small businessmen. There is no area where such support is more essential than the granting of small business loans.

Big business often has the flexibility to withstand temporary setbacks simply by shifting resources from another section of the firm or calling upon their ample conventional credit sources. When the same challenge is hurled against a small businessman, he may go under, not for any lack of ability or dedication, but simply because he does not have time to gather money needed to provide a transition to the next opportunity for profits, financial repair, and growth.

Since last October, however, the assistance that Congress has declared should be available from the Small Business Administration has been denied. In effect, we have said to the small businessman, "When disaster strikes elsewhere in the Nation, you must bear a special burden. You must survive without the programs that Congress said you should have." And, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means the first time that regular business loan suspensions have been decreed. And, unless Congress acts, it will not be the last.

The loan program suspension comes upon the heels of another serious blow at small business credit by the Government—the increase in the rediscount rate by the Federal Reserve Board. The consequent rise in the cost of credit is already being felt throughout the Nation. Therefore, small business now faces a two-pronged crisis in credit.

The purpose of this legislation is to insulate the business loan program against drains caused by natural disasters. I recognize that my bill does not solve the problem of stabilizing the disaster loan program so that its proper benefits will

always be available. The unpredictable timing and scope of such disasters poses special dilemmas in assuring the full effectiveness of such a program. Possible remedies in this field merits the attention of Congress but I strongly insist that the brunt of such disasters should not be placed upon small businessmen throughout the United States.

The business loan program must be given a permanent and protected status. Appropriations for these loans must be carefully planned, fully evaluated by Congress, and should not be permitted to rise and fall on the whim of nature.

Congress has wisely recognized the crucial value of small business to our free enterprise economy, therefore, I come before you today, Mr. Speaker, to plead for the reform and reinvigoration of the small business loan program and recommend this bill as a most important measure to translate congressional promise into permanent performance for the small businessmen of America.

Several of my colleagues have introduced similar bills and I am happy to join with them in this legislation.

Rehabilitation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing urban Members is the deterioration of once sound neighborhoods within their districts. I think those of us who have this problem have a responsibility to bring Government agencies into the area to reverse the trend. I have been working very hard on such a project in the Highbridge neighborhood of my district.

I have prepared a newsletter to be sent to the residents of the area explaining what I am doing and enlisting their cooperation. I include the text of the newsletter for the benefit of those of my colleagues who may be considering similar projects.

DEAR HIGHBRIDGE RESIDENT: I am delighted to greet you and to wish you and your family the best of health and good fortune for 1966.

This year has begun in a truly auspicious way for Highbridge. The city of New York and the Federal Government has officially committed themselves to arresting the deterioration of the neighborhood. A massive aid program, which will include \$1,600,000 for enforcement of building, sanitation, and electrical codes, street improvement work, streetlighting, street signs, and tree planting, will start in Highbridge in a few months. By spring, we should all see the beginnings of a new and more beautiful Highbridge.

In addition, construction for a combination new P.S. 126 and middle-income housing project at Ogden Avenue and 167th Street, will also commence this year. This is most welcome news to the community. I would like all the Highbridge residents who have worked unceasingly over the years to improve their community to know that their unselfish efforts are now being capped by concrete success. The power and resources of the Federal

and city governments are being marshaled to serve Highbridge and its residents.

P.S. 126 BECOMES A REALITY

After years of promises and negotiations, New York City announced on December 23 that construction on the P.S. 126 housing complex will begin this spring. The new P.S. 126 will replace P.S. 11, which was built in 1890.

In an important "first" for Highbridge, a 25-story apartment house will be built on top of the school. This is the first school-housing project ever built in the United States. I am hopeful that many Highbridge residents will obtain apartments in the project. It is now estimated that the apartments will rent at approximately \$25 per room per month.

The announcement by the city that construction on P.S. 126 will start this spring is the culmination of years of effort by several people living in Highbridge and a stepped up campaign by my office, headed by Jack Delaney. Jack and I worked very closely with Ernie Minott, Jim Egan, and the PTA's of P.S. 11 and 73 in bringing the attention of the highest echelons of Government to the many years of frustrating and disappointing delays in the development of P.S. 126.

We held repeated meetings with Eugene Hult, director of construction for the New York public school system; Herbert Evans, Director of Housing and Redevelopment Board; Budget Director Shea, and Chief Engineer Joseph Fitzpatrick, to get this project moving.

P.S. 126 will accommodate about 1,200 students. I will do everything in my power to assure that construction does start on schedule and that P.S. 126 is an example of the best in school architecture and design in the United States.

REHABILITATION OF HIGHBRIDGE BEGINS

When I was elected to Congress last year I assigned a top priority to the rehabilitation of Highbridge. Over the last few years, I have been concerned with the continued deterioration of the area. I was determined that this trend should be arrested promptly.

The first step I took was to invite a large number of civic, community, business, and religious leaders in Highbridge to become members of a Highbridge Conservation Committee.

The response of the community to my plea was immediate and encouraging. Within a few weeks, the committee was operational and Leo Weins, vice president of H. W. Wilson Co., took over as chairman. Leo brought to the committee his tremendous organizational and administrative expertise, and his splendid leadership qualities. We were also fortunate in having the full cooperation of Father Kavanagh and Father Reisig of Sacred Heart Church as well as Rabbi Taragin of the Highbridge Jewish Center.

The committee worked swiftly to draft a report outlining the specific problems in Highbridge for submission to Herbert Evans, director of the city housing and redevelopment agency. After a series of meetings with our committee, Mr. Evans agreed to assign a full-time staff director to coordinate the rehabilitation effort in Highbridge. The staff director will work out of an office which the Highbridge Conservation Committee has just leased at 1155 Woodycrest Avenue, at 167th Street.

We plan to invite all of you to a gala opening of this office, later this month, to help us drink a toast to the "New Highbridge."

The details of the program to rehabilitate Highbridge are as follows: The city of New York has applied to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for Federal funds under the Housing Act of 1965. As a result of our joint efforts, Highbridge will receive \$1,600,000 over 3 years. The largest single amount of money, \$500,000, will be spent to provide for strict enforcement of

building, sanitation, and electrical codes, for community organization specialists, and for architects and planners; \$300,000 is allocated for street improvement work, \$175,000 for curbs and gutters, \$220,000 for street lights, police and fire communications systems, \$5,000 for new street signs, and \$120,000 for the planting of trees.

In addition, property owners will receive federally insured 3-percent loans to carry out rehabilitation and the FHA will insure mortgages at 6½ percent interest. Low income homeowners are eligible for \$1,500 outright nonreturnable grants to improve their homes.

As you can see, the mighty resources of the Federal and city governments will now be used to give Highbridge a thorough face-lifting and will serve to stabilize the neighborhood.

The new borough president, Herman Badillo, has offered his full cooperation and that of his staff and office to insure the success of our project.

The members of the Highbridge Conservation Committee include: Leo Weins, chairman; Father Reisig, Father Kavanagh, Rabbi Taragin, Dan and Barbara Cetrone, John Clark, Al Correa, Bob Croghan, Jim Egan, Harold Finkelstein, Theodore Frank, Lillian Friedlander, Tom Goldrick, Pearl Granoff, Phyllis Grunauer, Eddie Green, Joe Hirsch, Rita Karig, Bernard Marcus, Mary McCrystal, Douglas Merrill, Ernie Minott, Frank Negron, Daniel Noonan, Florence Parker, John Respol, Stuart Rosensweet, Jean Sealo, Carl Sontz, Max Silverman, and Joe Polser. (These members have attended two or more meetings.)

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CLEAN VACANT LOT

To the tune of the latest rock and roll music provided by the Highbridge Crickets, 80 Highbridge youngsters cleaned the vacant lot opposite P.S. 73 (Anderson Avenue between 164th and 165th Streets) on Saturday, December 4.

The young men who worked from about 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., were supervised by Father Kavanagh from Sacred Heart Church, who, in a scene reminiscent of the Pied Piper of Hamelin, led the lads from Sacred Heart Church over the hill and down onto Anderson Avenue to attack the assortment of beer cans, broken bottles, abandoned bed springs, mattresses, ancient ice boxes, and other debris which disfigured the lot.

Other supervisory "straw bosses" were Patrolman Tom Goldrick, Charlie Minsberg of PAL, and John Minnich of the Boy Scouts.

By 1 p.m. the lot was cleaned and some 30 tons of debris were removed by a shuttle of sanitation department trucks. This is a great day's work which demonstrated once again the unusually high caliber of community spirit in Highbridge so evident in young and old alike.

The lot cleaning was organized by John Respol and Leon Weins of the Highbridge Conservation Committee in cooperation with Jack Delaney of my office. The men who worked so hard that chilly December morning are: Capt. Anthony McNally, of the 44th precinct; Supervisor Charles Byrnes, of the sanitation department; Dan Cetrone, of the Highbridge Capital; Roland Carpenter; William Cronin; Dan Duggan; Dr. Benjamin Fleissig; Joseph McTiernan; John McNamee; John Minnich; Paul Noonan; Dan Quinn; and Neil Sullivan.

WATCH FOR THE OPENING OF THE HIGHBRIDGE CONSERVATION PROJECT, 1155 WOODYCREST AVENUE (167TH STREET)

As you can see, Highbridge is finally on its way. I would like to thank the entire community for the vital support and cooperation which has enabled me and my entire congressional staff to serve you effectively in pushing forward with these exciting programs. I look forward to working closely

with an increasing number of Highbridge residents in the months ahead, for a newer and finer Highbridge neighborhood.

Statement by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Before the 25th Anniversary Celebration of United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 3, 1966, there were held throughout the Nation a series of celebrations marking a quarter of a century of service by the United Service Organizations. No one who has been a member of our Armed Forces or who has had a loved one serving for our flag could fail to be indebted to this great organization for the wholesome entertainment and recreation it has provided our troops throughout the world.

In New York City, the principal speaker at the USO banquet was Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. His vital theme was the historic challenge facing our Nation for the defense of Vietnam against Communist aggression.

A Gold Medal Award was presented to the Vice President. Previous high winners of the award, I am happy to point out, included His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur—posthumous.

I insert the text of Vice President HUMPHREY's outstanding address in the RECORD and precede it by the inscription of the award which was so appropriately conferred upon him.

TEXT OF INSCRIPTION ON GOLD MEDALLION PRESENTED ON FEBRUARY 3, 1966, BY USO OF NEW YORK CITY

The USO of New York City takes pride in presenting to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, its Gold Medal Award in recognition of his dedicated leadership and wholehearted support of USO as it continues to keep the faith with America's Armed Forces, February 3, 1966.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, USO, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

It is a high honor to receive your Fifth Annual Gold Medal, as it is a privilege to join with you in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the USO.

During this quarter of a century, over 20 million American men and women who have worn the uniform of their country have found in the USO a home away from home.

USO seeks to answer the two questions always on the mind of every GI wherever he is:

"Does anybody know I'm here? Does anybody care?"

And to these two questions you answer, in actions as well as words: "Yes, we do know and we do care."

We have an obligation to our American young men away from home—young men

serving without complaint and with a high standard of performance.

At Clark Field, near Manila, I saw recently young Americans—some of them terribly wounded—fresh from the battlefields of Vietnam. As I talked with them, they showed in every word and action those special qualities of courage and determination which Americans have always demonstrated in every war. We can surely be proud of them.

In Korea, I traveled north to the truce line and talked with American and Korean soldiers in this cold and bleak place.

Here, over a decade after the U.N. repelled Communist aggression, our American soldiers are still standing guard in one of freedom's loneliest and most remote frontiers.

The soldiers I saw in Clark Field and Korea, like those in other remote and often dangerous areas of the world, deserve the assurance that the American people have not forgotten them. And USO—which I saw in action at Tokyo, Manila, and Seoul—provides that kind of assurance.

And I think it is in the best spirit of American democracy that USO, representing our three major faiths, is nongovernmental and represents a wholly voluntary commitment on the part of the American people.

Why are so many American soldiers in Asia either standing guard or engaged in a shooting war?

They are there, primarily, to insure the peoples of the countries in which they are stationed the right to choose, the right to decide their own futures—in other words, to have the basic human rights of self-determination and of independence.

Self-determination and independence are threatened today by Asian communism. And so is man's search for peace. For we face adversaries who seek to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud—that militancy and force are the paths to final Communist victory.

During my two recent trips to Asia, I had the opportunity to talk with many national leaders. I sought their impressions of Asian communism, with which all of them have had firsthand experience. I did so because it is vital to know one's adversary as thoroughly as possible, and through many different eyes.

I did not come back with simple answers or simple panaceas.

Asian communism is a complex ideology. It is deeply rooted in the tragic past of Asia, yet it is raw and dynamic.

It isn't the timeworn, bureaucratic communism that has evolved in other places. It is aggressive. And its leaders are convinced of their ultimate success.

Its approach is not merely economic, although it capitalizes on the poverty and despair of the Asian peasant.

Its tactic is not merely political, although its hard-core followers are dedicated believers in Marxist doctrine, and although it wraps itself in the robes of nationalism to attract those who aren't yet ready for the full gospel.

Its thrust for power is not simply military, although it never has won power except by ruthless use of force—and I believe it never will.

The immediate threat is in Vietnam. What are the realities of today in Vietnam?

First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party. We face dedicated Communist-led revolutionaries seeking by force to subject a nation to their will. Some of these revolutionaries are from the south. Some are from the north. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the south. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from

Peiping. Their creed is communism and their means is terror.

Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere. Those who inspire and support the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear. Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda, of assassination, of sabotage, and of outright military action to gain their objectives throughout the world. In some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in the guise of a war of national liberation. In others, such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of regular troops across a national frontier.

The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin America.

Third, I would point to the reality that—faced with this aggressive force—our response has been measured and our objective peaceful.

Last April, President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation. He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the north in the hope that this might stimulate negotiation. In December we suspended the bombing again.

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means toward peaceful negotiation.

Initiatives outside our own—by the U.N. Secretary General; by 17 nonaligned nations; by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India, and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan, by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI—have been undertaken without success.

We have stated unequivocally that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

What has been the response from Hanoi and Peiping? I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

"The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people."

"Obviously the U.S. search for peace is only designed to conceal its scheme for intensifying the war of aggression."

From Peiping has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propaganda regarding President Johnson's—and I quote—"filthy and vicious . . . basket of peace."

It is clear that—in this time as in the past—those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force.

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam.

In announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

For we must not permit the struggle to become purely military, either in Vietnam or elsewhere.

We must persist with diplomatic initiatives for peace, in the United Nations and in all the capitals of the world.

We must counter the Communist political thrust with better politics—the politics of democracy, of self-determination, of human dignity.

We must help the nations of Asia move forward with economic and social reform so that the Asian citizen will have a real stake in his country.

This is where the struggle will be decided in the long run.

We have a clear obligation to help the people of Asia and of other continents to help themselves. It is for this reason that I commend to you the foreign aid program which President Johnson submitted to Congress this week.

The President has proposed, and I quote, "to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills, and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

We have set ourselves no easy task. It will require patience and fortitude for years ahead.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Capt. Harold F. Menges, Chaplain's Corps, U.S. Navy, offered the following prayer:

St. John 9:4: *And Jesus answered, I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.*

Holy Father, and God of all mankind, hear us pray.

Accept our grateful thanks for every blessing of Thine which has brought us to this good hour.

Bless us now with wisdom, good judgment, and sound counsel that we may do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. Help us to be intelligent, resourceful, and alert that we may face and solve the problems of the day in such a way as to spread justice and freedom throughout the land.

When we are ignorant, give us knowledge. When we are asleep, awaken us. When we walk in darkness, lead us in the path of the just which is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

We thank Thee for Thy servant with whom we walked and worked for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast received him into Thy nearer presence. Give unto his family and loved ones the consolation of Thy grace.

For in the Master's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

But I believe we can, in the end, succeed. For I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied.

We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here.

Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

Can we persevere in our search for peaceful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar in order for today may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement. I advise the House that, pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi, just granted, three bills from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be called up tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority leader indicate what those bills are?

Mr. ALBERT. They are House Joint Resolution 343, the Wind River irrigation project, Wyoming; H.R. 10674, disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgment for Otoe and Missouri Indians; and H.R. 1784, Cape Lookout National Seashore.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the distinguished majority leader indicate whether those three bills have rules?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. The request just made by the gentleman from Mississippi, to have until midnight tonight to file certain rules, related to those bills.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without establishing a precedent, that all Members desir-

ing to do so today may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include pertinent extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened. We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world. And we shall.

Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS FROM TODAY UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders in order for today be transferred to tomorrow and that they be called before those special orders previously scheduled for February 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This report describes a year of intense negotiation and research. It reveals an increased seriousness on the part of many nations toward the problems of arms control and disarmament.

In 1965, under the increasing pressure of the nuclear threat, arms control and disarmament was taken up at the first meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 5 years; at the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva; in the fall session of the 20th General Assembly; and in private diplomatic exchanges.

In all of these activities the U.S. position benefited from the thorough research and careful preparations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency,